THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

HISTORY AND EVALUATION OF THE ALBERTA LEADERSHIP

COURSE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

by

Ⓒ GEORGE ANDREW MACKENZIE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1971

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled "History and Evaluation of the Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals" submitted by George Andrew Mackenzie in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Date .June 30, 1971.....

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to examine the Alberta
Leadership Course for School Principals in order to deter-
mine whether or not continued operation of the Course was
warranted. The study examined the value of the Leadership
Course for the individuals who attended as participants in
the period 1966-1970, and the value of the Leadership
Course for Alberta school systems represented at the Course
in recent years. In addition, the study examined the
strengths and weaknesses of the purposes, activities, and
organization of the Course. This thesis also provided a
detailed history of the Alberta Leadership Course.

Data regarding the value, effects, strengths, and
weaknesses of the Course were obtained by means of mailed
questionnaires. The three instruments designed for this
study were mailed to 253 Course participants, 68 Alberta
school superintendents, and 91 Alberta school board chair-
men. The data were analysed primarily in terms of frequency
distributions, percentages, and means. Some statistical
analyses were performed using nonparametric statistics.

The findings indicated that the Alberta Leadership
Course has had considerable value for the Course partic-
ipants. The Course has been successful in providing
information about current trends and developments in educa-
tional administration, and in providing an opportunity for
the cooperative solution of problems. The intercommunication

of ideas between participants at the Course has been a particularly valuable experience for the participants.

The findings indicated further that numerous changes and improvements in the administrative practices of Course participants were attributed to Course attendance. Among the most common changes were increased staff and student involvement in decision-making, improved school communication, better staff-administrator relationships, and increased confidence on the part of the Course participants.

The younger and less experienced administrators tended to rate the value and changes resulting from the Course higher than did the older and more experienced participants.

Data from Alberta superintendents and school board chairmen indicated that the Leadership Course has been of value for the school systems mainly in terms of the improved attitudes and administrative practices of individuals within the systems who attended the Course.

The present purposes, organization, and activities of the Leadership Course appear to require only slight modifications or changes.

The results of this study lead to the general conclusion that the Alberta Leadership Course should be continued, although some changes in its organization and operation merit consideration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

NATURE OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

During the summer of 1956, the first Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals[*] was held at Concordia College in Edmonton, Alberta. Since then, this Course has been held annually in the Province of Alberta.

The Leadership Course was originally developed in an attempt to improve the quality of leadership at the school level and, consequently, to improve educational opportunities for students in the classrooms of the province (Worth, 1956a:1). The Course has continued to operate since 1956 with this same broad objective in mind.

The following organizations are cooperatively involved in sponsoring the Leadership Course: the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta School Superintendents' and Inspectors' Association, the Alberta Department of Education, and the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta through its Department of Educational Administration. The Course activities, in general, include a series of lectures, numerous group sessions, and a variety of special activities.

---

[*]Henceforth referred to as the Leadership Course.

BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

The Leadership Course has been only one of the
ways in which school administrators in Alberta have been
informed on developments in educational administration.
Since its formation in 1956, the Department of Educational
Administration at the University of Alberta, through its
graduate and diploma programs, has prepared students for
administrative positions and increased the administrative
potential of others who interrupted their employment in
order to pursue studies in educational administration. In-
service training has been provided through numerous seminars
and conferences offered by the Council on School Adminis-
tration of the Alberta Teachers' Association.

Except for 1957, the Leadership Course was attended
by over 60 persons each year until 1965, when attendance
began to decline slightly. In 1968, the attendance was
the lowest since the inception of the Course. The Policy
Committee began to question the value of the Course, and
the possibility of discontinuing the Course arose.[*] Despite
the fact that the Course was continued, and that the enrol-
lments increased in 1969 and 1970, the value of continuing
the Course was still a question which had not been resolved
completely.

---

[*]Minutes of a February, 1968 meeting of the Policy
Committee.

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Purpose of the Study

Due to the number and possible overlap of available in-service programs for school administrators, and since the value of the Leadership Course was being questioned, the primary purpose of this study was to examine the Course in order to determine if continued operation of the Course was warranted. A secondary purpose of the study was to review and relate the history of the Leadership Course through the years since its inception in 1956.

The Problem

This study was an attempt to examine the value and effects of the Leadership Course, and to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the organization of the Course. Specifically, the investigation focused upon the following three questions:

1. What was the value of the Leadership Course to the individuals who attended as participants in the period 1966-1970, and what were the perceived effects of the Course upon these persons?

2. What was the value of the Leadership Course to the school systems from which the participants came, and what were the effects of the Course upon these systems?

3. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the purposes, organization, and activities of the Leadership Course?

Significance of the Study

The importance of in-service activities for school administrators was well summarized by Goldhammer (1968:183) when he stated that ". . . continuous in-service education of administrators is one of the most imperative needs for the revitalization of education in our society." If this is so, then programs such as the Alberta Leadership Course are of extreme importance in the improvement of practicing educational administrators. An examination of the Leadership Course is therefore quite relevant.

Furthermore, Ayer (1951:63), in discussing in-service activities, stated that "we need to know more about the objectives, organization, procedures, and outcomes of current training projects." Although the Leadership Course has been operating since 1956, an extensive evaluation of the Course has not been performed. An evaluation has been made at the end of each Course by the participants, but this evaluation had certain weaknesses. First, only immediate reactions were obtained - reactions which might have changed or been modified with the passage of time. Second, these evaluations did not determine the value and effects of the Course to the school systems from which the participants came. Third, these evaluations did not determine what changes occurred as a result of the Course in the administrative practices of the individuals who attended the Course.

The only study which investigated the effects of the Leadership Course was one done by Blocksidge (1964). This study attempted to determine the effects of the 1958 Leadership Course upon the leadership practices of the Course participants. The early date of this study, as well as the confined nature of the investigation to only one aspect of the changes that the Course produced, further suggests the need to carry out an evaluation on the Alberta Leadership Course.

DELIMITATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

Delimitations of the Study

1. Only those Course participants who attended the Leadership Course from 1966 to 1970 were contacted.

2. The opinions and perceptions of Course lecturers, Course consultants, and assistant Course directors were not obtained.

Limitations of the Study

1. The results of this study are applicable only to the Alberta Leadership Course, and cannot be readily generalized as applying to similar in-service activities.

2. This evaluation was based on the perceptions of the Course participants, school board chairmen, and superintendents, and was therefore subject to any of a

variety of perceptual distortions that can occur in survey research.*

Assumptions Underlying the Study

    1. The data collection procedures were assumed to be adequate for the purposes of this study.

    2. It was further assumed that the items on the questionnaires were understood by the respondents, and that their responses constituted an honest expression of opinion.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

    Course participant. This is any person who attended an Alberta Leadership Course in a capacity other than as a director, consultant, or lecturer.

    Policy Committee. The Policy Committee comprises representatives of the sponsoring organizations of the Course and is under the chairmanship of the representative of the Alberta Department of Education.

    Leadership team. This group consists of the Course director, the assistant director, and the consultants.

---

    *For a discussion of this problem, see Kaplan (1964:131-134).

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

Chapter II is devoted to a review of pertinent literature. The need for in-service activities for school administrators is discussed, and the extent of activities similar to the Leadership Course in Canada and the United States is presented.

Chapter III relates the history of the Leadership Course. The inception of the Course is considered and significant developments in the organization and activities of the Course are discussed.

Chapter IV deals with the research methodology for the study, and explains the techniques employed in the analysis of the data.

The results of the data analysis are presented in Chapter V. In the concluding chapter, a summary of the study is given together with a discussion of the findings, and recommendations arising out of the study.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter examines the literature related
to the problem under investigation in this thesis. Pre-
vious research on the Leadership Course is described. The
importance of and need for in-service activities for school
administrators is examined. Some indication of the present
state of in-service activities for school administrators is
given. The final section indicates the extent to which in-
service leadership courses, such as the Alberta Leadership
Course, are operating in Canada and in the United States.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON THE LEADERSHIP COURSE

The only research which examined the Alberta Lead-
ership Course was completed by Blocksidge (1964). Using
the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (L.B.D.Q.),
Blocksidge attempted to examine the effects of the 1958
Leadership Course upon the leadership qualities of the Course
participants. The L.B.D.Q. was given to two matched groups
of principals: a group which had attended the Course, and a
group which had not attended. The L.B.D.Q. was administered
twice to each group: just before the 1958 Course; and a
year later, in May and June of 1959.

Blocksidge found that no significant change in "initiating structure" had occurred in the principals who attended the Course. The principals who had attended were found to have a higher degree of human-relations behavior following the Course, as evidenced by a significant increase in their "consideration" scores.

THE NEED FOR IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Deficiencies in Preparatory Programs

"Public education is not now, nor is it ever likely to be much better than its leadership." (American Association of School Administrators, 1963:32) If this statement is true, then the importance of developing high quality school administrators becomes obvious. One way in which this can be achieved is through improvement of preparatory programs for administrators. However, Moore (1957:96), Wynn (1957:483), Bessent (1969:5), Willis (1962:121), and Howsam (1966:11) all have pointed out that most of the administrative positions in education are held by practicing administrators who have completed their training. Therefore, improvement in the preparatory programs would have little effect on these persons.

Furthermore, many practicing school administrators have no pre-service training in educational administration. As Reeves (1967:174) stated, these administrators have ". . . a compelling need for something more substantial than that which can be gained by personal experience alone."

Obviously, more than improvement in the preparatory pro-
grams is required in order to improve the quality of
educational administration in schools.

Gathercole (1962:9) indicated that there are
limitations to the effectiveness of pre-service training
programs. He felt that these programs provide only acade-
mic familiarity with the profession, and that it is not
until a person has actually practiced administration that
he becomes aware of the problems. MacKay (1964:74) and
Hass (1957:17) agreed with Gathercole and stated that
deficiencies in the pre-service training programs is one
reason in-service activities are necessary.

New Developments in Educational Administration

The second major reason why in-service activities
are necessary for school administrators is because of new
developments in the field of educational administration.
Frasure (1968:1-3), Gathercole (1962:9), and Hass (1957:
14-16) suggested that rapid social, technological, and
cultural changes in our society have forced rapid changes
to occur in schools. This in turn has meant that the field
of educational administration has become more complex.
Howsam (1966:9) and Johnson (1959:57) stated that due to
the increasing complexity of the administrative role, new
skills and knowledge are required of the educational admin-
istrator.

Paralleling the increased complexity of the admin-
istrative task has been an increase in the knowledge and

techniques which are available to the administrator. One of the goals of in-service activities is to keep the practioner abreast of new knowledge in his field. The expanding knowledge available in the field of educational administration is further justification for in-service activities for school administrators.

Theory Practice Gap

Schmuck (1968:143) suggested that a major reason why in-service education for educational administrators is necessary is because a gap exists between existing theory and research in administration and the actual practice of administration in the schools. Despite the abundance of research knowledge available, little of it has influenced the practices in schools. Schmuck felt that in order to bridge this gap, collaborative participation in cooperative activities is necessary between the theorists and the practioners in the schools. Again, the importance of and need for continuous in-service education of school administrators is clearly indicated.

Summary

Three reasons for providing in-service training for school administrators have been given: deficiencies in the preparatory programs for administrators; the emergence of new developments in the field of educational administration; and the existing gap between theory and practice in school administration.

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation (1961:29), which has
provided tremendous stimulus for improvement of educational
administrators, summarized the need for in-service educ-
ation as follows:

> There is an overwhelming need to transmit to the
> men on the job as much new knowledge as possible to
> enable them to carry on more effectively their work
> of improving the educational systems of the United
> States and Canada.
> This need for in-service training will probably
> increase in future years as civilization becomes
> more complex and as research is accelerated. Even
> the well-trained administrator of today will need
> in-service education tomorrow.

PRESENT STATE OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

The American Association of School Administrators
(1963:79-105) published the results of a national survey
on the state of in-service education for school adminis-
trators in the United States in 1963. This report, com-
bined with the Thirty-Eighth Yearbook of the same assoc-
iation (Moore, 1960:88-99) provided a comprehensive picture
of the state of in-service activities for administrators
in the United States up to that time. Their findings
indicated that a wide variety of programs were existent,
ranging from high level concentrated seminars to informal
evening meetings of administrators. A variety of groups
were involved in the sponsorship and organization of these
activities, ranging from institutes of higher education to
local school boards. However, they also pointed out that
only a relatively small number of school systems were being

reached by these activities.

Howsam (1966:12-17) reported the results of a similar survey by the University Council for Educational Administration in 1966. Though a considerable variety in the type and format of programs was found, the most common activities were conferences, workshops, and seminars. Howsam observed critically that the overall picture was one of ". . . sporadic activities conducted in rather traditional patterns." (Howsam, 1966:16-17)

The W.K. Kellogg Foundation, in surveying the extent of in-service education for school administrators in 1962, broke the large number of activities down into these categories: university sponsored activities, state or province wide cooperatively sponsored activities, cooperative field studies, and in-service publications for school administrators. Once again, the indication was that the conference or institute was the most popular type of in-service activity (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1962:24-43).

A rather unique type of in-service activity, originated in 1963 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (1970:7), was the Administrative Internship Project. In this program, carefully selected promising administrators were placed in selected schools under the guidance of innovative principals. By 1969, as many as 443 interns were involved in this program.

SIMILAR IN-SERVICE COURSES

Introduction

The present section attempts to indicate the nature and extent of courses similar to the Alberta Leadership Course. A limited number of similar courses are held in Canada, and a detailed description of each is provided. However, due to the large number of such courses which are held in the United States, only a limited number of these are discussed, and in less detail.

The similar courses are classified according to their sponsorship. In the first section, those which are co-sponsored are discussed. The second section deals with those courses or workshops which are sponsored by universities. The final section is devoted to courses sponsored by Departments of Education.

Co-Sponsored Courses

A very prominent course for Canadian school administrators is the annual Canadian Education Association Short Course, held at Banff, Alberta, each spring. This course is sponsored by the Canadian Education Association in conjunction with the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta, and attracts school inspectors and superintendents from all across Canada. The Short Course attempts to provide the opportunity for educational administrators to explore problems in administration, and to provide for

intercommunication of ideas among the participants. Lec-
tures, group sessions, and opportunity for individual con-
sultation are the major activities of the Course. Many of
the provincial leadership courses have been patterned after
the Canadian Education Association Short Course (Canadian
Education Association, 1954).

A two day conference which is held at Banff, Alberta
in October is the Western Canada Educational Administrators'
Conference. This two day conference was initiated in 1968
by the Council on School Administration of the Alberta
Teachers' Association. School administrators from western
Canada attend lectures and group discussions in order to
study topics of current interest to school administrators
(Ratsoy, interview, 1971).

In British Columbia, a two week Principals' Con-
ference and Workshop is held every second year at the
University of British Columbia (Watt, correspondence, 1970).
This course, which has been held since 1958, is co-sponsored
by the British Columbia School Trustees' Association, the
British Columbia Department of Education, the British
Columbia Teachers' Federation, and the University of British
Columbia. The major purpose of the course is to provide the
principals with an educational experience which will be of
use in their own administrative practice. The course
activities are similar to those of the Alberta Leadership
Course, and include lectures, group sessions, independent
study, and special features such as film presentations.

The Saskatchewan Principals' Short Course is co-sponsored by the Saskatchewan Department of Education, the University of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan School Trustees' Association, the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, and the Saskatchewan Council on Educational Administration. The Teachers' Federation and the Department of Education each provide an annual five hundred dollar grant to the Course. The purposes, format, and organization of this Course are very similar to those of the Alberta Leadership Course. However, the Saskatchewan Short Course is only one week long. Operating since 1957, the Saskatchewan Course has attracted as many as 95 participants (McDowell, correspondence, 1970).

The one week Manitoba Principals' Leadership Course is co-sponsored by six organizations. The Manitoba Department of Education and the Manitoba Teachers' Society both provide annual grants to the Course. Also, the Manitoba Association of School Trustees, the Manitoba School Inspectors' Association, the University of Manitoba, and the Manitoba Association of Principals assist in sponsorship by providing support and personnel for the Course. The purposes, organization, and activities of the Manitoba Course are nearly identical to those of the Alberta Leadership Course (Peach, correspondence, 1970). The Manitoba Course was initiated in 1966. Previous attempts at such courses were made by the Manitoba Teachers' Society as

early as 1958, inspired by persons from Manitoba who had

attended the Alberta Leadership Course.

The Quebec Association of Protestant School Admin-

istrators has held an annual one week summer workshop for

principals since 1956. Guest speakers, panel discussions,

and workshop groups have helped school administrators

keep abreast of current trends in educational administration

(Stafford, correspondence, 1970).

Co-sponsored leadership courses similar to the

Alberta Leadership Course have not been held in Newfound-

land, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, or Nova Scotia.

The Ontario course is discussed in the third part of the

present section.

In the United States, a large number of co-sponsored

courses similar to the Alberta Leadership Course have been

held. For example, the Texas Association of School Adminis-

trators and the Texas Education Agency cooperated in 1955

to develop a statewide project for improvement of school

administration called the Project in School Administrator

Development (W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1961:36-37). In this

extensive project, the state was divided into 28 areas, and

in each area the school superintendents organized and oper-

ated various in-service activities. The major activities

included summer conferences, area workshops, study groups,

and publications. Although extremely active for many years,

the Project in School Administrator Development has been

discontinued in recent years (Thomas, correspondence, 1971).

University Sponsored Courses

In the previous section it was reported that a number of universities were cooperatively involved in the sponsorship of leadership courses. In many cases however, universities provide the sole sponsorship of the courses.

The Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta has annually sponsored the Banff Regional Conference in April. School superintendents from western Canada are invited to attend this three day conference. Through lectures and group discussion, this conference attempts to produce closer liaison between practicing superintendents and professors of educational administration. In this sense, this conference attempts to break down the conflict between theory and practice (Bumbarger and Friesen, 1969:iv).

Numerous universities in the United States provide in-service courses for school administrators. Two examples are considered here. In the late 1950's and early 1960's the University of Chicago sponsored resident seminars for school superintendents. These brief seminars provided the opportunity for discussion of current administrative problems and new techniques in the field. However, the University of Chicago has not continued these seminars in recent years (Bridges, correspondence, 1971).

The Department of Educational Administration at Teachers College, Columbia University has held a Super- intendents' Work Conference since about 1950. As well, an Elementary and Secondary School Principals' Work Con- ference has been held in recent years. In both conferences, lectures, group discussions, panels, films, and tours are provided in order to provide information on recent develop- ments in the field of school administration (Smith, cor- respondence, 1970).

Department of Education Sponsored Courses

The Ontario Department of Education has sponsored a unique type of leadership course each summer. The Ontario Department of Education Principals' Course is of four weeks duration, and is held at various universities in Ontario each summer. In 1970, a total of 240 persons participated in the course, which was held at six centers at the same time. The Course is divided into three sections, with one predominantly for elementary personnel, and the other two for secondary administrators. These three sections at the various universities are exposed to common lectures, group sessions, and simulation exercises. However, for some part of the Course period, the three sections have different lecture and group sessions according to their specific level of school concentration. Each of the four weeks of the Course is given a different theme, around which the Course activities are centered. Upon completion

of the Ontario Principals' Course, each participant is granted an Interim Principal's Certificate which is made permanent upon the completion of further study or experience in the field of educational administration (Dalzell, correspondence, 1970).

Again, there are a number of similar courses in the United States. For example, beginning in 1963, the Oregon State Department of Education operated a series of workshops for school administrators at both a local and state level. The purpose of these conferences was to strengthen administrative leadership in curriculum development (American Association of School Administrators, 1963: 98). Although these conferences have been discontinued in recent years, the Oregon Department of Education has remained active in in-service activities for administrators (Herbert, correspondence, 1970).

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The only previous research on the Alberta Leadership Course was completed by Blocksidge in 1964. In examining the effects of the 1958 Leadership Course upon the leadership qualities of the Course participants, Blocksidge found that the participants evidenced a higher degree of human-relations behavior following the Course.

The literature examined in this chapter indicated that in-service activities for school administrators have

been considered necessary and important. Due to deficiencies in pre-service programs, to new developments in educational administration, and to a gap between existing theory and practice in the field, in-service activities for administrators are deemed necessary.

An examination of the present state of in-service education for school administrators indicated a variety of activities. The most common of these have been conferences, workshops, seminars, and short courses. Co-sponsored courses similar to the Alberta Leadership Course have been held in British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec, and in various centres in the United States. In addition to provincial or state courses, the Canadian Education Association Short Course has attracted educators on a national basis.

Similar courses have been sponsored by only one body. In some cases, universities have provided the sole sponsorship of in-service courses. Provincial or state Departments of Education have sponsored similar courses in Ontario and in various parts of the United States.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF THE ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE
FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

INTRODUCTION*

This chapter relates the history of the Leadership
Course. The inception of the Course is discussed in the
first section. The second section is devoted to an explan-
ation of the purposes, organization, and activities of the
Course. The final section traces the significant yearly
developments in the Leadership Course.

COURSE INCEPTION

According to Weidenhamer (Interview, 1971), certain
educational developments in Alberta were related to the
inception of the Leadership Course. The centralization of
small school districts into larger counties and divisions
had resulted in larger schools with more complex adminis-
trative problems for principals. Despite the fact that the
principal's role had become more complicated, few principals

_____

*Unless otherwise indicated, the information pre-
sented in this chapter was obtained from files of the Lead-
ership Course in the possession of the chairman of the
Policy Committee and of the director of the Course.

had specialized administrative training. The Division*
of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta
was founded in 1956. Only limited numbers of principals
could take advantage of the available programs during the
early years of the Division's growth.

Consequently, superintendents, trustees, principals,
and Department of Education personnel began to realize that
a short term training program for principals was expedient.

The initial proposal that a brief leadership course
for school principals should be held in Alberta was made to
the Provincial Advisory Committee of the Canadian Education
Association by Alberta superintendents who attended the 1955
Canadian Education Association Short Course (Canadian Educ-
ation Association, 1956:1). This Advisory Committee, headed
by T.C. Byrne, formed a subcommittee in July, 1955, to
discuss the feasibility of such a course for the province.
Minutes of September 12, 1955 meeting indicated that the
following persons were on the subcommittee: J.C. Jonason,
superintendent of schools; H.T. Sparby, representing the
Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta; L.
Kunelius, representing the A.S.T.A.**; T.C. Byrne, repre-
senting the provincial Department of Education; and F.
Tarlton, representing the A.T.A.***

---

*Called "Department" since 1963.

**Alberta School Trustees' Association.

***Alberta Teachers' Association.

As a result of this meeting, several recommendations were put forth. The Committee suggested that a three week course be held in July, 1956 as part of the University summer session, with participation limited to about 70 school principals. The participants were to be selected and financed by their local school boards. The Committee recommended that a policy committee be established comprising representatives of teachers, trustees, superintendents, the University of Alberta, and the Department of Education.

These recommendations were then submitted to the Provincial Advisory Committee of the Canadian Education Association. A memorandum from W.H. Swift, Deputy Minister of Education, to W.E. Frame, Chief Superintendent of Schools, on December 7, 1955, stated that the Advisory Committee had approved the basic plan which had been submitted by the sub-committee. Furthermore, this memorandum indicated that the Canadian Education Association executive had approved a one thousand dollar grant for the course, and that the Board of Governors of the University of Alberta had appointed W.H. Worth, assistant professor in the Division of Elementary Education at the University of Alberta as Course director.

The first meeting of the Policy Commitee of the Alberta Leadership Course was held on December 19, 1955. The minutes of this initial meeting indicated that the following persons were present: H.S. Baker, representing the University of Alberta; T.C. Byrne, representing the provincial Department of Education; R. Hennig, from the

A.S.T.A.; G.L. Mowat, representing the A.S.S.I.A.*; and
F. Tarlton, from the A.T.A. Acting in an advisory capa-
city were A.G. Andrews, from the A.S.T.A.; E.C. Ansley,
from the A.T.A.; and H.T. Coutts and J.W. Gilles, from the
University of Alberta. W.H. Worth, Course director, was
also in attendance.

At this initial meeting, the plans for the 1956
Leadership Course were formulated. The Policy Committee
decided that the first Course would be held at Concordia
College, Edmonton, from July 9 to July 27, 1956. The cost
of sending a participant would be 180 dollars, with this
cost to be borne by the participants' school boards. W.H.
Worth was to determine and organize the activities of the
1956 Course.

On the basis of these initial plans, the Alberta
Leadership Course became a reality in the summer of 1956.
Since then, the Course has been held annually, with purposes,
activities, and organization very similar to those estab-
lished for the initial Course.

<div align="center">PURPOSES, ORGANIZATION, AND ACTIVITIES OF

THE LEADERSHIP COURSE</div>

Introduction

The purposes, organization, and activities of the
Leadership Course have remained nearly the same since the

_____

*Alberta School Superintendents' and Inspectors'
Association.

inception of the Course. Therefore, before presenting the
specific yearly developments, this section discusses the
purposes, organization, and activities of the Course in
a general manner.

Course Purposes

The initial purposes of the Leadership Course were
explained by Worth (1956a:i):

> The Course was developed in an effort to improve
> the quality of leadership at the school level and,
> consequently, to improve educational opportunities
> for the boys and girls in the classrooms of the
> Province. It was intended to serve four purposes:
>
> 1. To provide an opportunity for further exploration
> of problems in educational administration and supervi-
> sion of concern to members of the Course;
>
> 2. To provide an opportunity for individual members
> to form plans for later local action;
>
> 3. To provide members with an opportunity of gaining
> further understanding of leadership philosophies and
> techniques, including group process, evaluation, and
> communication;
>
> 4. To stimulate the intercommunication of educational
> ideas and practices between various schools and adminis-
> trative areas, thereby contributing to mutual under-
> standing and appreciation of educational developments.

The Course purposes remained the same until 1962,
when slight modifications were made. The specific purposes
of the Leadership Course in 1962 were as follows (Policy
Committee, 1962:2):

> 1. To provide the opportunity for principals to
> become better informed of emerging trends in the
> organization and administration of education at the
> school level;

2. To provide the setting for intercommunication of educational ideas and leadership practices;

3. To provide an opportunity for the cooperative solution of problems peculiar to the principalship;

4. To provide an opportunity for individuals to obtain assistance and advice regarding their own unique problems and form plans for later local action.

Except for minor changes in wording, the first three purposes listed above have remained in effect up to, and including the 1971 Course. However, the fourth purpose has not been included in the Course's stated purposes since 1966 (Policy Committee, 1966:2).

Course Activities

The activities of the Leadership Course in some or all of the years of its operation have included lectures, morning group and general sessions, problem area sessions, simulation exercises, individual study, and special activities. Some of these activities have been held every year, while others have been used only in certain years.

The lecture series has been an integral aspect of the morning sessions in all years of the Course. Professors in the field of education and related disciplines and experienced practicing administrators have provided lectures on a variety of topics during the lecture series. Following the lectures, the Course participants have been broken into small groups to discuss the lecture. A consultant, a member of the leadership team, has worked with each group. His function has been to stimulate the discussions and provide

additional information when necessary. Also, Course par-
ticipants have served as chairmen or co-ordinators, and
as recorders for group sessions.

The final activity of the morning program of the
Course almost without exception has been a general session.
In this session, participants have been given the opport-
unity to pose problems or questions to the lecturer, or to
comment on his topic.

The afternoon sessions of the Course have consisted
of a variety of activities. The most common activity has
been the problem area group sessions. The problem area
sessions have been held every year except 1963, 1964, and
1965. In most years the participants have remained in the
same groups for both the morning and afternoon group ses-
sions.

In the problem area sessions, discussions have
focused on the interests of the Course participants who
have been assigned to groups on the basis of their interests
as expressed in a pre-Course questionnaire. A few excep-
tions to this procedure occurred. In 1962, and in 1969
and 1970, participants were grouped according to the size
and type of school from which they came.

An afternoon activity of the Leadership Course which
has been used every year since 1963 is the "in-basket"
simulation exercise. This activity has provided the Course
participants with an opportunity to become involved in
simulated decision-making situations. For the 1970 Course,

the simulation materials were modified by changing the dates and letterheads on them. With the 1970 dating and the Alberta, rather than American, letterheads, Course participants were apparently more satisfied with the simulation materials (Bergen, interview, 1971). Other modifications were also made over the years in the amount of time devoted to background study of the materials, the approach taken in handling the in-basket items, and their analysis. For example, in 1966 the time devoted to background study was decreased (Miklos, interview, 1971).

An annual Course activity from 1956 until 1965 was individual study and consultation. Time was provided during the afternoon sessions in which the Course participants could read the material provided in a Course library, or discuss their own problems with the leadership team. Miklos (Interview, 1971) indicated that problems in providing adequate library materials, organizing the consultation, and motivating Course participants to undertake individual study of a scholarly nature led to the discontinuance of the activity in 1966.

An annual feature of the Leadership Course has been special activities of various kinds. Film presentations and visits to a variety of educational institutions have been part of the Course in most years. A banquet has been an annual event of the Leadership Course. Another activity which has been featured in certain years, including 1962,

1963, 1964, and 1968 was a "Meet the Sponsor Night." In
other years, this latter activity was replaced by an
opening session in which sponsor representatives were in
attendance.

Many of the special activities have been co-ordin-
ated and organized by a steering committee, a group com-
posed of an elected member of each problem area group with
the assistant Course director as chairman.

In summary, the activities of the Leadership Course
have ranged from formal lectures to informal social gather-
ings. A wide variety of activities, requiring varying
degrees of participation, have been used in an attempt to
achieve the purposes of the Course.

Course Organization

The basic organization of the Leadership Course
has been altered very little in the years of its operation.
The present section is devoted to an explanation of the
organizational framework within which the Course operates.

Personnel. The Policy Committee of the Leadership
Course has the responsibility for establishing policy guide-
lines for the Course. The Policy Committee has always con-
sisted of a representative of the following organizations
or agencies: the A.T.A., the A.S.T.A., the University of
Alberta's Faculty of Education, the provincial Department

of Education, and the A.S.S.I.A.* Since 1963, the Council

on School Administration has been represented as well. A

central office person from the A.S.T.A., the Dean of the

Faculty of Education, and the Summer Session Director have

been on the Policy Committee in an advisory capacity.

The Department of Education representative has

chaired the Policy Committee in all years except 1956,

when the Committee was under shared chairmanship. The

Course director has acted as secretary for the Policy Com-

mittee.

Table I provides a list of Course directors and

assistants from 1956 to 1971. In Table II, a complete list

of members of the Policy Committee is provided. The individ-

uals who served on the Policy Committee in an advisory

capacity are not shown in Table II. T.C. Weidenhamer,

Secretary Treasurer of the A.S.T.A., and H.T. Coutts, Dean

of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta,

have served in an advisory capacity every year in which the

Course has operated. J.W. Gilles, Director of the University

of Alberta Summer Session, also served in an advisory capac-

ity every year until 1969, when he was succeeded by S.C.T.

Clarke. Other persons who served in an advisory capacity in-

cluded E.C. Ansley from 1956 to 1958, and A.G. Andrews in 1956.

_____

*With the formation of the Conference of Alberta
School Superintendents (C.A.S.S.), and with changes occur-
ring with respect to A.S.S.I.A., it is likely that some
changes will have occurred in the structure of the Policy
Committee by 1972.

TABLE I

LEADERSHIP COURSE DIRECTORS AND ASSISTANT DIRECTORS,

1956 - 1971

Year	Course director	Assistant
1956	W.H. Worth	- - - -
1957	W.H. Worth	- - - -
1958	J.H.M. Andrews	- - - -
1959	J.H.M. Andrews	H.J. Uhlman
1960	J.H.M. Andrews	H.A. Wallin
1961	L.W. Downey	M. Skuba
1962	L.W. Downey	M. Skuba
1963	F. Enns	J. Peach
1964	F. Enns	W.G. Roberts
1965	E. Miklos	W.P. Eddy
1966	E. Miklos	H.E. Farquhar
1967	E. Miklos	A.N. Stewart
1968	D.A. MacKay	R. Plaxton
1969	J.J. Bergen	K. Wilson
1970	J.J. Bergen	N.J. Chamchuk
1971	J.J. Bergen	D.J. Cornish

TABLE II

MEMBERS OF POLICY COMMITTEE,

1956 - 1971

Representatives:

Year	A.T.A.	A.S.T.A.	Fac. of Ed.*	Dep. of Ed.**	A.S.S.I.A.	C.S.A.***
1956	F. Tarlton	R. Hennig	H.S. Baker	T.C. Byrne	G.L. Mowat	-
1957	H.J.M. Ross	R. Hennig	A.W. Reeves	T.C. Byrne	L.A. Walker	-
1958	W.R. Eyres	R. Hennig	A.W. Reeves	S.A. Earl	F. Hannochko	-
1959	W.R. Eyres	R. Hennig	A.W. Reeves	S.A. Earl	O. Massing	-
1960	W.R. Eyres	E. Parr	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	O. Massing	-
1961	S.C.T. Clarke	E. Parr	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	W. Korek	-
1962	E.J. Ingram	E. Parr	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	E. MacDonald	-
1963	E.J. Ingram	M.E. LaZerte	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	J.F. Swan	H.J. Hall
1964	N. Hrynyk	M.E. LaZerte	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	I. Goresky	H.J. Hall
1965	K.W. Bride	M.E. LaZerte	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	L. Kunelius	H.J. Hall
1966	E.J. Ingram	M.E. LaZerte	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	W. McGrath	H.J. Hall
1967	N. Hrynyk	M.E. LaZerte	A.W. Reeves	R.E. Rees	E. Erickson	H.J. Hall
1968	N. Hrynyk	M.E. LaZerte	F. Enns	R.E. Rees	F.B. Facey	A. Myhre
1969	N. Hrynyk	M.E. LaZerte	G.L. Mowat	R.E. Rees	F.B. Facey	A. Myhre
1970	K.W. Bride	H.L. Gunderson	G.L. Mowat	E.K. Hawkesworth	F.B. Facey	A. Myhre
1971	K.W. Bride	W.A. Penrose	G.L. Mowat	E.K. Hawkesworth	H.A. Pike	F.D. Oliva

*Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta **Department of Education ***Council on School Administration

The administration of the Course has always been the responsibility of the Course director. In 1959, the position of assistant director was created. The director and his assistant plan the Course activities, correspond with school systems, and guide the leadership team during the operation of the Course. The director plans the Course budget which is approved by the Policy Committee. The budget was submitted to the President of the University of Alberta for final approval until 1970, when the new President, M. Wyman, delegated the formal approval of the budget to the Director of the Summer Session. The University continues to act as "banker" for the Course through a trust account.

The leadership team consists of the director, the assistant, and the consultants. The consultants are selected by the sponsoring organizations in consultation with the Course director. As well, doctoral students from the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta have served as consultants most years (Bergen, interview, 1971).

Prior to 1969, the Vice-President of the University approved the appointments of assistant director, consultants, and lecturers. Since then, the Course director has assumed the responsibility of selecting and appointing his staff within the guidelines approved by the Policy Committee.

<u>Other organization details</u>. The Leadership Course

has generally been of two weeks duration. In 1956 the

Course was three weeks long, and in 1957 it was shortened

to two and half weeks. As the interest of participants

appeared to decline in the third week, Andrews (Corre-

spondence, 1971) shortened the 1958 Course to two weeks.

Generally, the Course has been held during the second and

third weeks in July.

Since its inception, a feature of the Course has

been the provision of residence accommodation for all

participants, including the leadership team. Prior to

1969 the Course was held at Concordia College in Edmonton,

Alberta. In 1969 the Course was located at St. Joseph's

Seminary in Edmonton, and in 1970, the Alberta School for

the Deaf hosted the Course. This will likely continue to

be the site of the Course for some years (Bergen, interview,

1971).

Since the beginning of the Leadership Course, nearly

all larger school systems in Alberta have been represented

by participants. Most school systems have been represented

many times, and some by more than one representative per

year. The A.T.A. and the teachers' associations of British

Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have sent representat-

ives to the Course several times. Participants have been

present from the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. On

occasion, private schools in Alberta have sent representat-

ives, and some individuals have attended the Course at

their own expense.

The revenue for the operation of the Course has
been provided by the sponsoring school boards, who pay a
designated fee for each participant they sponsor. The
amount of this fee in each year is shown in Table III.

The major expenses of the Course include accom-
modation, salaries and honoraria for the leadership team
and lecturers, travel disbursements, supplies, duplication
of materials, and publication of the Alberta School Princi-
pal. The cost of this publication is offset partially by
subscriptions.

SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENTS

Introduction

The previous two sections of this chapter have pro-
vided information about the establishment and organization
of the Leadership Course. This section provides information
about specific developments under each director.

Worth (1956 and 1957)

Beginning in 1961, each Course had a specific theme
around which the lectures and group discussions were center-
ed. However, the early courses, from 1956 to 1960, had no
specific theme. Instead, each Course attempted to discuss a
wide range of topics such as school organization, leadership,
supervision, and communications.

The Course activities in these initial Courses were
lectures, problem area groups, special features, and indiv-

TABLE III

FEES FOR SPONSORING PARTICIPANTS TO THE LEADERSHIP
COURSE AND COURSE ATTENDANCE,
1956 - 1971

Year	Fee (in dollars)	Attendance
1956	180	66
1957	180	57
1958	180	68
1959	180	70
1960	180	63
1961	180	67
1962	200	55
1963	200	60
1964	200	62
1965	200	58
1966	220	53
1967	220	56
1968	230	49
1969	240	61
1970	250	64
1971	260	60*

*Approximate registration as of June 15, 1971.

idual study and consultation. The problem area discus-
sions, although varying from year to year, placed special
emphasis on supervision of teachers, school organization
and management, and in-service education in schools (Worth,
1956a).

Andrews (1958, 1959, and 1960)

The Course lecture series was first published as
a printed volume in 1958. The Alberta School Principal
has been an annual publication since then. The position
of assistant director was established in 1959. Other
changes included the invitation of vice-principals and
female participants for the first time in 1959, and the
initiation in 1960 of the practice of allowing prior
participants to return to the Course (Andrews, 1958).

Downey (1961 and 1962)

The participants who attended the 1961 Course were
exposed to activities of the same nature as those of pre-
vious Courses (Policy Committee, 1961:4-10). The theme of
the 1961 Course was "Skills of an Effective Principal."
Lectures and group sessions centred on four major skill
areas of importance to principals: business managerial
skills, human managerial skills, program development skills,
and innovative skills. Hrynyk (Correspondence, 1971) in-
dicated that the theme of the 1961 Course was particularly
relevant at that time because new ideas on the role of the

principal were emerging in Alberta. Reeves (1961:2), in fact, stated that ". . . a broader concept of the principalship is emerging, . . . one that requires the principal to be an educational leader in his own school."

Two innovations were attempted at the 1962 Course. First, membership in the problem area groups was based on the size and type of the participant's school rather than on an expressed interest basis as had been the practice before. Second, a "Meet the Sponsor Night" was initiated (Policy Committee, 1962).

The theme of the 1962 Leadership Course was "Organization-A Means to Improved Instruction." The Course examined the traditional types of school organization and discussed alternatives such as team teaching, dual progress, and non-gradedness (Downey et al., 1962). Discussion of such new forms was particularly relevant in the early 1960's, since many of these types of organization were receiving attention in Alberta schools, according to Weidenhamer (Interview, 1971).

Enns (1963 and 1964)

The major innovation of the 1963 Course was the use of "in-basket" simulation exercises produced by the University Council for Educational Administration (Enns, correspondence, 1971). These simulation exercises replaced the problem area groups in 1963.

"Tasks of the Principal" was the 1963 Course theme, and as a result, the lecture series focused on some of the major tasks of the principal, including school management, administration of personnel, public relations, program development, and planning (Enns, 1963:vii). Enns (Correspondence, 1971) indicated that this theme would have been relevant at any time, and that it enabled the Course participants to focus on some of the more pressing aspects of the principalship.

The 1964 Course theme was "The Principal and Program Development" and the lectures concentrated on this vital administrative task. The importance of the theme was explained by Enns (1964:vii) as follows: "The development of the school's instructional program, . . . comprises one of the major functions of supervision."

Hrynyk (Correspondence, 1971) confirmed the importance of the 1964 theme when he indicated that curriculum development at the school level was gaining importance by 1964.

Miklos (1965, 1966, and 1967)

The 1965 Course featured activities similar to those of the previous two years, although the "Meet the Sponsor Night" was discontinued (Policy Committee, 1965). The 1965 theme, "Program and Personnel" reflected the fact that ". . . the concerns or tasks of a principal include two major emphases: the educational and the organizational." (Miklos, 1965:vii)

A number of changes occurred in the activities of the 1966 Course. The problem area groups, based on participants' expressed interests, were used again for the first time since 1962. Fewer, but more intensive sessions were held than in previous Courses. Participants were re-grouped for the second week and concentrated on areas different from those of the first week. With the continued use of simulation exercises, the length of the Course day was slightly extended. A feature during one morning of the 1966 Course was a Leadership Clinic, in which the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire was examined and discussed. The questionnaires had been completed by each participant's staff prior to the beginning of the Course. Individual study was discontinued as a formal Course activity in 1966 (Policy Committee, 1966:10-15).

The theme of the 1966 Course was "The Principal and Educational Change" and as a result, the program focused attention on some of the changes taking place in society and in schools. The Course also attempted to discuss the role of the principal in relation to educational change (Policy Committee, 1966:10). Miklos (Telephone conversation, 1971) indicated that this theme was particularly relevant due to the fact that innovations and the innovative process were receiving considerable attention at the time of the 1966 Course.

The one major change for the 1967 Course was the introduction of workshop sessions, in which the results

of a Council on School Administration questionnaire were examined and discussed. The questionnaire provided a basis for discussions on the role of the principal in Alberta schools (Miklos, 1967:1).

The 1967 Course theme, "The Principalship: Today and Tomorrow," directed the participants' thoughts and discussions towards the development of a concept of the principalship which included various tasks, skills, and processes (Miklos and Stewart, 1967). The task of developing such a concept was felt to be relevant by Miklos (Telephone conversation, 1971), since the tasks and role of the principalship are constantly undergoing modification and development.

MacKay (1968)

The major developments which occurred in the 1968 Course included the elimination of Saturday morning sessions, and the reintroduction of a "Meet the Sponsor Night." (MacKay, 1968a:1) The workshop on the principalship and the problem area sessions were held again.

The Course theme, "Principal as an Administrator," was rather general, but as MacKay (1968a:iii) stated, ". . . the principal's role has become highly complicated, . . . there is some disagreement as to the precise nature of the role." Each of the Course lectures focused on a distinct administrative process, in an attempt to provide a comprehensive view of the administrative function (MacKay, 1968b).

Bergen (1969, 1970, and 1971)

The activities of the 1969 Course remained basic-
ally the same as in previous years. The Course featured
workshops on the nature of the principalship, which es-
sentially combined the workshops and problem area sessions
used in the previous two years. Panels of junior and
senior high school students were employed on two afternoons
in order to aid principals in a realistic consideration of
any need for student involvement in decision-making.

The theme of the 1969 Course, "Administration for
Student Development," reflected the fact that ". . . not
only principals, not only teachers, but also students must
be heard." (Bergen, 1969:vi) According to Hrynyk (Corres-
pondence, 1971), the 1969 theme was very relevant in a time
of student rebellion and unrest such as was characteristic
of 1969.

The 1970 Course featured some unique developments.
N.J. Chamchuk, assistant director, introduced and carried
out a Delphi study[*] with the Course participants. Parts
of the 1970 Course were videotaped, and the tape was later
made available to Course participants and school systems
for local in-service activities. A panel comprising teachers,
students, parents, and school board members was employed in
order to assist principals in forming more realistic per-

---

[*]The Delphi technique is a future forecasting pro-
cedure.

ceptions of the expectations of various publics with res-
pect to school programs, policy, and administrative pro-
cedures.

The Course theme was "The Principal's Role in the
'70's." Bergen stated that ". . . during the decade of
the 70's more change may take place in Alberta's schools
than has taken place during the last two or three decades."
(Bergen and Chamchuk, 1970:vi) For this reason, the 1970
Course theme seemed particularly relevant, according to
Bergen.

A major change planned for the 1971 Course involved
the operation of two or three afternoon sessions in Edmonton
schools, in order to provide more realistic settings for
the discussion of innovations which have been introduced
with a measure of success in those schools. Also, intensive
workshops on the evaluation of teaching and on the intro-
duction of program budgeting in schools were to be conducted
at the 1971 Course.

A further development in 1971 was the planned
Counsellor Leadership Seminar under the direction of D.D.
Sawatzky, University of Alberta's Department of Educational
Psychology. This seminar, modelled in part after the Lead-
ership Course, was to be held at the same time and at the
same location. Some aspects of both Courses were to be
held in common. The informal interaction of principals and
counsellors, to be facilitated during the two weeks in

July, were expected to be of value to each group (Bergen, interview, 1971).

Future Courses

Commenting about the possible developments which might occur in the activities and organization of the Leadership Course in the 1970's, Bergen (Interview, 1971) stated that:

. . . specialized "institutes," each about a week in duration, could take the place of the Course as it now exists. The purpose of each institute would be to make the participants thoroughly familiar with one practice or innovation. It may be possible to do this in part, with some reorganization, within the framework of the present Course.

Weidenhamer (Interview, 1971) agreed with Bergen's ideas in this respect and felt that the Leadership Course might become less general in nature in the future.

SPONSOR INVOLVEMENT

Each of the sponsoring organizations of the Leadership Course provide assistance for the organization and operation of the Course. Worth (1956b:14) summarized the involvement of the sponsors of the Course as follows:

The school boards provided most of the money, while superintendents looked after liaison and publicity in the field and helped select the participants. The Teachers' Association provided the services of a consultant and encouraged the attendance of principals. Key personnel of the Department were made available to help staff the Course. The University placed its administrative machinery at our disposal, and the Faculty arranged for a member of its staff to serve as coordinator of the project.

Since 1956, the sponsoring organizations have con-
tinued to provide support of the type indicated by Worth.
Consultants have been provided by the A.T.A., A.S.T.A.,
and the Departments of Education through the A.S.S.I.A.
(Bergen, correspondence, 1971). The school boards have
continued to provide financial assistance, and the super-
intendents have cooperated in selecting participants and
promoting the Course.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Based upon an initial proposal by Alberta super-
intendents to the Provincial Advisory Committee of the
Canadian Education Association in 1955, the first Alberta
Leadership Course was held in July, 1956. A one thousand
dollar grant from the Canadian Education Association pro-
vided financial assistance for the initiation of the Course.

The Course was intended to provide Alberta school
administrators with an opportunity to learn about emerging
developments in educational administration, to share ideas
with each other, and to develop plans for later local
action. Through a variety of activities, including lectures,
general and small group discussions, problem area sessions,
simulation exercises, individual study, and special features,
the Leadership Course has attempted over the years to achieve
these same general purposes.

The Course director, a member of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta, with the help of an assistant, has been responsible for the operation of the Course. A Policy Committee, comprising representatives from the A.T.A., the A.S.T.A., the A.S.S.I.A., the University of Alberta's Faculty of Education, and the provincial Department of Education, has had the responsibility for establishing policy guidelines for the Course.

Nearly all of Alberta's larger school systems have sent representatives to the Course each year. The participants, numbering between 50 and 70 each year, reside in residences at the Course site for the duration of the Course.

W.H. Worth was the Course director for the first two years. He was followed by J.H.M. Andrews, from 1958 to 1960; L.W. Downey, from 1961 to 1962; F. Enns, from 1963 to 1964; E. Miklos, from 1965 to 1967; D.A. MacKay, in 1968; and J.J. Bergen, from 1969 to 1971. Each Course since 1961 has been given a theme around which lectures and group activities have focused.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents a description of the sources
of data and of the populations from which data were col-
lected.   The size and nature of the populations, question-
naire construction, and the distribution of the question-
naires are described.   The percentage returns of each type
of questionnaire are reported and a brief overview of the
statistical analysis of the data is presented.

SOURCES OF DATA

Most of the data for this study were obtained
through mailed questionnaires completed by Leadership
Course participants, Alberta school superintendents, and
Alberta school board chairmen.   Some data were obtained
from various persons through correspondence, and other
data were gleaned from the Leadership Course files.

Data from Leadership Course Participants

Data from participants who attended the Leadership
Course in the period 1966 to 1970 were obtained by means
of the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" (Appendix A).
Files of the Leadership Course provided names of the part-
icipants, and the addresses were obtained from A.T.A. list-

ings. All participants who attended the Course in the period 1966-1970 were contacted. The questionnaires were mailed to the 253 participants in February, 1971, and two weeks later, a reminder letter (Appendix D_1) was sent to the participants who had not returned the questionnaire. The number and percentage returns are shown in Table IV.

Data from Alberta Superintendents

All Alberta superintendents in systems which had been represented at the Leadership Course in the period 1966-1970 were contacted. Sixty-eight questionnaires (Appendix B) were mailed to these superintendents in February, 1971. Names and addresses were obtained from a 1970 Department of Education list. A follow-up letter (Appendix D_2) was mailed to the superintendents two weeks after the questionnaires were sent out. Numbers and percentage returns of the "Questionnaire to Superintendents" are shown in Table IV.

Data from School Board Chairmen

In February, 1971, 91 questionnaires (Appendix C) were mailed to Alberta School board chairmen in all systems which had been represented at the Leadership Course in the period 1966-1970. Names and addresses were obtained from a 1970 A.S.T.A. list. Two weeks after the mailing of the questionnaires, a reminder letter (Appendix D_3) was mailed to the chairmen. Numbers and percentage returns of the questionnaires are shown in Table IV.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED TO AND RETURNED
BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS, SUPERINTENDENTS,
AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRMEN

Questionnaire to:	Number Distributed	Number Returned		Returns Usable	
	N	N	%	N	%
Course Participants	253	182	72	177	70
School Superintendents	68	59	87	57	84
School Board Chairmen	91	56	61	55	60

Other Sources of Data

Data regarding the extent of courses similar to
the Leadership Course were obtained through correspondence.
Information concerning the history of the Course for
Chapter III was obtained through correspondence with all
past and present Course directors and selected members of
the Policy Committee. Where the correspondence did not
provide sufficient information, follow-up interviews were
held with these persons. In addition, much of the infor-
mation regarding the history of the Leadership Course was
obtained through a thorough investigation of the files
of the Leadership Course.

INSTRUMENTATION

Selltiz et al. (1959:50) referred to research which
attempts to ". . . gain familiarity with a phenomenon or to
achieve new insights into it, in order to formulate a more
precise research problem or to develop hypotheses," as
"formulative" or "exploratory" research. As a result of
the exploratory nature of the present study, little prior
research existed on which to base the data collection.
Therefore, the questions included in the instruments were
derived from the experience and background of the researcher,
through consultation with his advisor, and from evaluation
questionnaires developed by directors of the Course.

The primary data collection instruments were three questionnaires (Appendices A, B, and C). The processes used for construction of the questionniares paralleled those outlined by Kornhauser and Sheatsley (1959). Each questionnaire contained both forced and free response type questions. A brief description of each questionnaire follows.

Questionnaire to Course Participants

The "Questionnaire to Course Participants" was designed to obtain the Course participants' perceptions of the value and effect of the Course upon themselves. The instrument was also designed to determine their opinions regarding strengths and weaknesses of the organization and objectives of the Course.

After composing and revising the first draft of the questionnaire, copies of the second draft were mailed to 15 former Course participants. An examination of the 13 returns provided a basis for making a number of modifications to the questionnaire. Additions, deletions, and amendments were required before composing the final draft.

Questionnaires to Superintendents and to School Board Chairmen

The "Questionnaire to Superintendents" and the "Questionnaire to School Board Chairmen" were designed to determine the superintendents' and the chairmen's perceptions of the value and effect of the Course upon the Course partic-

ipants and upon the school systems in Alberta.

A pilot study was conducted, in which question-
naires were mailed to five superintendents and to five
chairmen. Four returns from superintendents and three
returns from chairmen provided the basis for minor mod-
ifications of the questionnaires.

THE POPULATION

Course Participants

All Course participants who attended the Course in
the period 1966-1970 were contacted. The decision not to
contact participants prior to 1966 was based on the assump-
tion that their recollection of the Course would not be
sufficiently exact to be of value in this study. The present
research is based on the assumption that the data from
participants who did not return the questionnaires would
not have changed the results.

Selected personal characteristics of the Course part-
icipants who responded to the questionnaire are presented
in Table V. Characteristics presented in this Table include
the participants' sex, age category at the time at which
they attended the Course, year of Course attended, position
prior to attending the Course, and experience in adminis-
tration prior to attending the Course. Table V indicates
that most of the respondents were males and that their ages
were rather evenly distributed over all age categories, with

TABLE V

SELECTED PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
COURSE PARTICIPANTS
(N=177)

Personal Characteristics	Number of Respondents	% of N
Sex		
1. Male	170	96
2. Female	7	4
Age Category		
1. 20-29	33	19
2. 30-39	74	42
3. 40-49	52	29
4. 50 or over	18	10
Course Attended		
1. 1970	46	26
2. 1969	43	24
3. 1968	39	22
4. 1967	26	15
5. 1966	23	13
Position Prior to Attending Course		
1. Principal	101	57
2. Vice-Principal	65	37
3. Other	11	6
Experience in Administration (Prior to Course)		
1. Five or more years	77	43
2. Less than five years	88	50
3. None	12	7

the fewest respondents being in the 50 or over age cate-
gory. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents were princi-
pals, and six percent had other positions. Only seven
percent had no administrative experience prior to the
Course, while 50 percent had less than five years, and
43 percent had five or more years experience.

Superintendents and Chairmen

All superintendents and chairmen in systems which
had been represented at the Leadership Course since 1966
were sent questionnaires. The superintendents and chairmen
contacted were persons who held such positions in 1970.

The questionnaire responses indicated that 24 of
the superintendents and themselves attended a Leadership
Course, 15 as participants, and nine as Course consultants.

Of the responding board chairmen, questionnaire
results indicated that ten were no longer the chairmen of
their board. Since the questionnaires to the chairmen
were based on a 1970 list, it was expected that some would
no longer be serving as chairmen.

The present research is based on the assumption that
data from superintendents and chairmen who did not respond
did not affect the results of the study.

OVERVIEW OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, the
analysis of the data was primarily descriptive. Data were

analysed to indicate frequencies, percentages, and means.

Statistical analysis was employed in the examination of some of the data. In order to examine relationships among variables for significant associations, the chi-square test was used. The chi-square test for independent samples was used to test for significant differences between superintendents and chairmen on certain responses. For the statistical analysis, a p. value of .05 or less was selected as a suitable level for significance.

Due to the nature of the data collected, the decision was made to use nonparametric statistics in the statistical analysis. Siegal (1956:19) and Ferguson (1966:354) indicated that where the data is in nominal or ordinal scales, such as was the data collected for the present study, nonparametric statistics should be used. Ferguson (1966:354) also stated that nonparametric statistics should be used where the normality of the variables in their populations is not known, as was the case in this study.

To facilitate statistical analysis, the data from the questionnaires were transferred to I.B.M. cards. The computation was completed on the University of Alberta's 360/67 computer, using the "NONP10" program developed by the Division of Educational Research at the University of Alberta.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the results of the analysis
of the data obtained from the questionnaires. The chapter
is divided into three major sections. In the first section,
an analysis of the value of the Leadership Course for the
Course participants is provided. The value of the Course
for the school systems from which Course participants have
come is considered in the next section. An analysis of the
strengths and weaknesses of the objectives, organization,
and activities of the Course is presented in the final sec-
tion.

VALUE OF THE LEADERSHIP COURSE TO THE

COURSE PARTICIPANTS

Course Participants' Responses

Item 7 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants"*
examined the general reaction of the participants to the
Leadership Course they attended. The distribution of re-
sponses is presented in Table VI. Table VI indicates that

---

*For the exact wording of items referred to in this
chapter, see the questionnaires in Appendices A, B, and C.

TABLE VI

VALUE OF THE LEADERSHIP COURSES AS
PERCEIVED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS
(N=177)

Perceived Value of Courses	Responses	
	f	% of N
Great value	31	17
Substantial value	101	57
Some value	42	24
Little value	3	2
No value	0	0

74 percent of the respondents found the Course to be of substantial or great value to them. Only two percent of the respondents indicated that the Course was of little value.

Items 18 to 23 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" were designed to obtain the participants' perceptions of the value of each of the Course's activities. The responses to these items are presented in Table VII. Table VII also presents the results of the responses to items 24 to 29. These items examined the Course activities in which participants felt they had acquired information or learnings which they actually put to use in their own administrative practice. An examination of Table VII provides considerable information about the value of the Leadership Course.

The fact that the mean value assigned to each of the activities was above three indicates that all activities were perceived to be of relatively high value by the part-icipants. The highest mean (3.8) was recorded for the problem area sessions, followed closely by the other five activities. The morning general sessions elicited the lowest mean evaluation (3.5).

Further examination of Table VII indicates that the problem area sessions had the highest total percentage of "very much" and "substantial" value responses, while the morning general sessions had the lowest total percentage of responses in these categories. Furthermore, the problem

TABLE VII

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEIVED VALUE OF EACH COURSE ACTIVITY
AND EXTENT OF USAGE IN OWN ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE
(N=177)

Course Activity	Perceived Value										Mean*	Acquired Learnings Applied in Practice	
	Very Much		Substantial		Some		Little		None				
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		f	%
Lecture Series	19	(11)	85	(48)	58	(33)	13	(7)	2	(1)	3.6	79	45
Morning Group Sessions	25	(14)	89	(50)	50	(28)	12	(7)	1	(1)	3.7	76	43
Morning General Sessions	19	(11)	70	(39)	70	(39)	17	(10)	1	(1)	3.5	38	21
In-Basket Sessions	45	(26)	59	(33)	39	(22)	27	(15)	7	(4)	3.6	96	54
Problem Area Sessions	39	(22)	79	(44)	51	(29)	8	(5)	0	(0)	3.8	105	59
Special Features	34	(19)	67	(38)	55	(31)	17	(10)	4	(2)	3.6	46	26

*Obtained by averaging the numbers assigned to each category: a 5 to the "Very Much" category; a 4 to the "Substantial" category; and so on down to a 1 for the "None" category.

area sessions had the lowest percentage of responses in the "little" and "no" value categories.

Examination of the activities in which usable learnings were acquired by the Course participants indicates that the problem area sessions were rated the highest, with 59 percent of the respondents indicating that they acquired information or learnings in these sessions which they put to use in their own practices. The in-basket sessions rated second highest, and the morning general sessions were lowest, with only 21 percent of the participants stating that these sessions helped them acquire knowledge or learnings which subsequently were used.

In summary, Table VII indicates that while all activities were of value to the participants, certain activities were more beneficial than others. The problem area sessions seemed to be of most value, while the morning general sessions appeared to be the least valuable to the participants.

Items 10 to 14 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" examined the participants' perceptions as to how well the Course purposes were achieved. The responses to these items are presented in Table VIII.

Table VIII indicates that the Course was successful to some degree in achieving all of its purposes. The second purpose, "providing for intercommunication of educational ideas," was rated the highest, with a mean response of 4.3.

TABLE VIII

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW WELL THE LEADERSHIP
COURSE ACHIEVED ITS PURPOSES
(N=177)

Course Purpose	Degree of Achievement										Mean*
	5. Very Success.		4. Quite Success.		3. Somewhat Successful		2. Somewhat Unsuccess.		1. Quite Unsuccess.		
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
Providing information about emerging trends in educational administration	23	(13)	93	(53)	48	(27)	13	(7)	0	(0)	3.7
Providing opportunity for intercommunication of ideas	70	(40)	84	(48)	22	(11)	1	(1)	0	(0)	4.3
Providing opportunity for cooperative solution of problems	36	(20)	73	(41)	50	(28)	17	(10)	1	(1)	3.7
Providing assistance with own unique problems	7	(4)	26	(15)	93	(52)	41	(24)	10	(6)	2.9
Formulation of plans for later local action	9	(5)	53	(30)	76	(43)	33	(19)	6	(3)	3.2

*Obtained by averaging the numbers assigned to each category.

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents indicated that the Course was either "quite" or "very" successful in achieving this purpose. "Providing information about emerging trends" and "the cooperative solution of problems" had identical mean responses of 3.7. "Formulation of plans for later local action" followed with a mean response of 3.2.* The purpose which was achieved least successfully was "providing assistance with the participants' own unique problems." This purpose had a mean response of 2.9.*

The Leadership Course appears to have been quite successful in providing the opportunity for discussion and intercommunication with other administrators. The Course also had value to the participant because of its ability to provide up to date information about developments in administration. However, the Course does not appear to have been too successful in providing assistance with the participants' unique local problems.

Items 43 and 44 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" provided information about specific effects of the Leadership Course on the participants. Item 44 provided information about promotions or advancements to which participation at the Course was a contributing factor. The results, presented in Table IX, indicate that 64 percent of the respondents felt that there had been no perceived change

*This has not been one of the stated purposes of the Course since 1965.

as a result of the Course. Fourteen percent indicated that attendance at the Course had contributed to administrative promotions, and ten percent reported improved status. The open ended responses to this question indicated that the Course had improved the participant's chances of promotion and had encouraged the continuation of studies in educational administration in some cases.

Since a large number of the Course participants were principals, advancements or promotions would not likely occur frequently for these persons. Table IX also provides data regarding advancements or promotions of participants who were not principals when they attended the Course. The findings indicate that for 25 percent of the non-principal participants, Course attendance had contributed to administrative promotions. Fourteen percent of these individuals indicated that the Course contributed to advancement other than promotion, 21 percent reported improved status, and 40 percent stated that there had been no perceived change. These findings indicate that a higher percentage of the non-principal participants reported advancements or promotions as a result of Course attendance than did the participants who were principals.

The specific changes in the participants' administrative practices were obtained from item 43 of the "Questionnaire to Course Participants." The responses, presented in Table X, show that 81 percent of the respondents felt that

TABLE IX

ADVANCEMENTS OR PROMOTIONS OF COURSE PARTICIPANTS
RESULTING FROM ATTENDANCE AT THE
LEADERSHIP COURSE

Advancement or Promotion	All Participants (N=177)		Participants Other Than Principals (N=76)	
	f	% of N	f	% of N
Administrative promotion	24	14	19	25
Improved status	22	12	16	21
Advancement other than promotion	17	10	11	14
No perceived change	114	64	30	40

TABLE X

AMOUNT OF CHANGE IN COURSE PARTICIPANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICES RESULTING FROM COURSE ATTENDANCE
(N=177)

Amount of Change	Responses	
	f	% of N
Considerable	15	9
Some	128	72
Little or none	34	19

some or even considerable change had resulted from Course
attendance. Nineteen percent reported that little or no
change in their administrative practices had occurred.

An examination of the open ended response comments
for item 43 provided detailed information as to the nature
of the changes in administrative practices which had oc-
curred as a result of Course attendance. The Course
participants' responses are presented in Table XI along
with similar information obtained from questionnaires to
superintendents and board chairmen.* The most commonly
mentioned changes by the Course participants were a better
understanding of the administrator's role, increased staff
participation in decision-making, improved staff communic-
ation and relations, and more confidence in themselves.
Improvements in student relationships and increased student
involvement in decision-making were mentioned several times.
Numerous other improvements in administrative practice were
reported. Apparently the Leadership Course has had numerous
concrete effects upon the administrative practices of the
Course participants.

Superintendents' and Chairmen's Perceptions

Item 13 on the "Questionnaire to Superintendents"
and item 10 on the "Questionnaire to School Board Chairmen"

_____

*Discussed in detail on page 68.

TABLE XI

CHANGES OR IMPROVEMENTS IN COURSE PARTICIPANTS'
ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF
ATTENDANCE AT THE COURSE

Change	Frequency of Mention		
	Course Partic. (N=177)	Supts. (N=57)	Chair-men (N=55)
1. Better understanding of the administrator's role.	10	5	1
2. Increased staff participation in decision-making.	9	7	2
3. Improved communication with staff	8	1	1
4. Better staff-administrator relationships.	7	4	5
5. More confidence in self	8	2	-
6. Greater sensitivity towards others in the school.	5	1	-
7. Increased student involvement in school decisions.	4	2	-
8. Better relationships with students	4	-	-
9. A more "open" atmosphere in the school.	4	1	-
10. Better evaluation procedures.	3	-	-
11. Improved allocation of resources.	3	-	-
12. Better school public relations.	3	4	-
13. Wider and more liberal view of school activities.	3	3	-
14. Improved timetabling.	3	1	-
15. Greater flexibility.	2	-	-
16. Increased community involvement in school affairs.	2	1	-
17. More consideration of alternatives before reaching a decision.	2	-	-
18. Improved attitude towards administration.	2	4	1
19. Increased student freedom in the school.	2	-	-
20. Better staff and student relationships.	1	-	1
21. Improved pupil reporting procedures.	1	-	-
22. Better teacher placement.	1	-	-
23. More efficient office procedures.	1	-	-

were designed to obtain the superintendents' and chairmen's

perceptions of the number of changes in administrative

practices of Course participants resulting from Course

attendance. The responses to these questions are pre-

sented in Table XII.

Table XII indicates that the superintendents and

the chairmen rated the changes produced almost identically.

The chi-square probability of .23 indicates that the two

group's responses were not significantly different. Neither

superintendents nor chairmen stated that the Courses had

produced numerous changes, but in both cases, the majority

of responses indicated that "some" or "substantial" changes

had resulted from Course attendance.

Along with the questions regarding the number of

changes, the questionnaires provided an opportunity for

the superintendents and chairmen to explain exactly what

changes they felt had occurred. These responses are tab-

ulated in Table XI (page 67).

The most frequently mentioned changes by the super-

intendents were increased staff participation in decision-

making, better understanding of the administrator's role,

better staff-administrator relationships, improved school

public relations, and an improved attitude towards adminis-

tration.

The number of changes indicated by school board

chairmen was less, probably because the chairmen would not

TABLE XII

CHANGES IN COURSE PARTICIPANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICES RESULTING FROM COURSE ATTENDANCE
AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS AND
SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRMEN

| Changes Produced | Number of Responses | | | |
| | Supts. | | Chairmen | |
	f	%	f	%
1. Numerous	0	0	0	0
2. Substantial	3	5	4	7
3. Some	42	73	41	75
4. Very few	12	22	7	13
5. None	0	0	3	5
Total Number	57		55	
Mean Response	3.2		3.2	

Chi-square = 4.34   df = 3   p. = 0.23

have been in as close contact with the participants as the superintendents would have been. The most commonly reported change by the school board chairmen (Table XI) was improved staff-administrator relationships and increased staff participation in decision-making.

Further examination of Table XI indicates that, in terms of total frequency of mention by Course participants, superintendents, and chairmen, the most commonly reported change resulting from Course attendance was increased staff involvement in decision-making. This was closely followed by better staff-administrator relationships and better understanding of the administrator's role. Other changes which were commonly mentioned included more confidence in self, improved staff communication, improved attitude towards administration, and better public relations.

Effects of Background Variables on Perceived Value of Course

This section examines the relationships between certain background variables, including the Course participant's age, position, and administrative experience, with the Course participant's ratings of the general value of the Course.

Table XIII provides a classification, according to certain background variables, of the responses to item 7 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants," which examined the general value of the Course. A brief analysis of the

relationships of each variable with the perceived value
is given below.

Age category. The relationship between age of
respondents and perceived value of the Course was not found
to be significant. However, an examination of the fre-
quency of response suggests a tendency for younger part-
icipants to rate the value of the Course somewhat higher
than did the older respondents.

Experience in administration. The relationship
between experience and general Course reaction is not
significant. The frequency of responses suggests, that
those persons with less than five years experience per-
ceived the Course to be of greater value than did other
respondents.

Position prior to attending Course. No association
appears to exist between administrative position and per-
ceived general Course value.

Year of Course attended. A probability of .043
indicates that a significant relationship exists between
the year of Course attended and reaction to the value of
the Course. The 1967 Course participants appeared to rate
their Course highest, while the 1966 Course participants
rated their Course lower than participants from other years.
The differences indicated for the years may have been assoc-
iated with a number of factors, such as the specific lecture

TABLE XIII

GENERAL VALUE OF LEADERSHIP COURSE, AS PERCEIVED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Perceived Value of Course					χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Great f(%)	Substantial f(%)	Some f(%)	Little or None f(%)	Total Number		
Age Category	20-29	6(18)	21(64)	6(18)	0(0)	33	15.31	.083
	30-39	11(15)	49(66)	11(15)	3(4)	74		
	40-49	10(19)	23(44)	19(37)	0(0)	52		
	50 and over	4(22)	8(45)	6(33)	0(0)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	19(19)	57(56)	23(23)	2(2)	101	1.95	.992
	Vice-Principal	11(17)	38(59)	15(23)	1(2)	65		
	Other	1(9)	6(55)	4(36)	0(0)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	9(12)	40(52)	26(34)	2(2)	77	10.61	.101
	less than 5 yrs	19(22)	55(63)	13(14)	1(1)	88		
	none	3(25)	6(50)	3(25)	0(0)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	5(11)	27(59)	13(28)	1(2)	46	26.85	.043*
	1969	11(26)	23(54)	9(20)	0(0)	43		
	1968	5(13)	23(59)	10(26)	1(2)	39		
	1967	9(35)	15(58)	2(7)	0(0)	26		
	1966	1(4)	13(57)	8(35)	1(4)	23		

*Indicates significance at the .05 level.

content, the resources provided by the consultants, and
the nature of the activities.

Effects of Background Variables on Changes Produced

Table XIV provides a breakdown of the responses
to item 43 on the questionnaire to participants, which
relates to changes resulting from Course attendance,
according to the background variables. Each variable
is examined below.

Age category. No significant relationship exists
between the amount of change resulting from Course attend-
ance and the age category of the participant.

Experience in administration. Since the probabil-
ity of .003 is significant at the .05 level, a relationship
exists between prior experience and amount of change result-
ing from Course attendance. The responses indicate that
the participants who had less than five years experience
perceived the most change to have occurred. The least
change apparently occurred in the cases of persons with no
administrative experience. However, since these persons
had not been in administration, they may not have been in
a position where administrative change could have occurred.

Position prior to attending Course. No significant
relationship was found between position and amount of
change resulting from Course attendance.

TABLE XIV

AMOUNT OF CHANGE PRODUCED IN COURSE PARTICIPANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF COURSE ATTENDANCE, ACCORDING
TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES

Variable	Variable Categories	Change Produced						Total Number	χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Considerable		Some		Little or None				
		f	%	f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	4	(12)	20	(61)	9	(27)	33	5.38	.496
	30-39	3	(4)	57	(77)	14	(19)	74		
	40-49	6	(12)	38	(73)	8	(16)	52		
	50 and over	2	(11)	13	(72)	3	(17)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	5	(5)	76	(75)	20	(20)	101	8.82	.184
	Vice-Principal	6	(9)	47	(72)	12	(19)	65		
	Other	4	(37)	5	(45)	2	(18)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	3	(4)	55	(71)	19	(25)	77	16.27	.003*
	less than 5 yrs	11	(13)	68	(77)	9	(10)	88		
	none	1	(8)	5	(42)	6	(50)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	3	(7)	30	(65)	13	(28)	46	17.32	.027*
	1969	2	(5)	32	(74)	9	(21)	43		
	1968	2	(5)	31	(80)	6	(15)	39		
	1967	7	(27)	16	(62)	3	(11)	26		
	1966	1	(4)	19	(83)	3	(13)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Year of Course attended. The probability of .027 indicates a significant relationship between Course attended and amount of change. The most changes appear to have occurred in the practices of 1967 Course participants, followed closely by participants in the 1966 and 1968 Courses.

Effects of Background Variables on Achievement of Course Purposes

Items 10 to 14 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" examined the participants' perceptions of how successfully each Course purpose had been achieved. This section examines the relationships between selected background variables and the ratings of each purpose. The five Course purposes, in brief, were as follows:

Purpose A: Providing information about emerging trends and developments in educational administration.

Purpose B: Providing the opportunity for the intercommunication of ideas among Course participants.

Purpose C: Providing the opportunity for cooperative solution of problems.

Purpose D: Providing assistance with the participant's own unique problems.

Purpose E: Formulation of plans for later local action.

Significant relationships occur with three of the five purposes. In Table XV the results of the analysis for Purpose B are given. Table XVI presents the analysis for Purpose C, and the analysis for Purpose D is presented in Table XVII. The following sections examine each background variable.

Age category. For purposes B and D (Tables XV and XVII) the chi-square values are significant at the .05 level. In both cases, the respondents in the 20-29 age category appear to have rated the Course highest in success- ful achievement of each purpose.

Experience in administration. No significant rela- tionships occur for any of the three purposes under analysis.

Position prior to attending Course. For purposes C and D (Tables XVI and XVII), significant relationships appear. In both cases, the respondents who were vice- principals rated the achievement of the purposes higher than did the principals.

Year of Course attended. No significant relation- ships exist in any of the three purposes. However, an examination of responses as recorded in Table XVII suggests that greater satisfaction was expressed by participants of the 1967 Course with respect to achievement of this purpose.

TABLE XV

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW WELL PURPOSE B (INTERCOMMUNICATION OF IDEAS) WAS ACHIEVED, ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Achievement of Purpose B									χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Very Success.		Quite Success.		Somewhat Success.		Somewhat Unsuccess.		Total No.		
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	22	(67)	9	(27)	2	(6)	0	(0)	33	18.46	.030*
	30-39	28	(38)	34	(46)	11	(15)	1	(2)	74		
	40-49	17	(33)	30	(58)	5	(9)	0	(0)	52		
	50 and over	3	(17)	11	(61)	4	(22)	0	(0)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	42	(42)	48	(48)	11	(10)	0	(0)	101	3.79	.925
	Vice-Principal	23	(35)	31	(48)	10	(15)	1	(2)	65		
	Other	5	(45)	5	(45)	1	(10)	0	(0)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	28	(36)	38	(49)	11	(15)	0	(0)	77	2.19	.901
	less than 5 yrs	36	(41)	41	(47)	10	(11)	1	(1)	88		
	none	6	(50)	5	(42)	1	(8)	0	(0)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	19	(41)	22	(48)	5	(11)	0	(0)	46	10.18	.600
	1969	15	(35)	21	(49)	7	(16)	0	(0)	43		
	1968	11	(28)	21	(54)	6	(15)	1	(2)	39		
	1967	14	(54)	9	(35)	3	(11)	0	(0)	26		
	1966	11	(48)	11	(48)	1	(4)	0	(0)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XVI

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW WELL PURPOSE C (COOPERATIVE SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS) WAS ACHIEVED, ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Achievement of Purpose C									χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Very Success.		Quite Success.		Somewhat Success.		Somewhat Unsuccess.		Total		
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	6	(18)	15	(46)	9	(27)	3	(9)	33		
	30-39	13	(17)	32	(43)	22	(30)	7	(10)	74	5.70	.931
	40-49	11	(21)	21	(40)	15	(29)	5	(9)	52		
	50 and over	6	(33)	5	(28)	4	(22)	3	(17)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	16	(16)	44	(44)	30	(29)	11	(11)	101		
	Vice-Principal	17	(26)	25	(39)	18	(28)	5	(7)	65	26.52	.009*
	Other	3	(28)	4	(36)	2	(19)	2	(19)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	19	(25)	24	(31)	22	(29)	12	(15)	77		
	less than 5 yrs	14	(16)	44	(50)	24	(27)	6	(7)	88	10.28	.246
	none	3	(25)	5	(42)	4	(33)	0	(0)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	7	(15)	19	(41)	14	(31)	6	(13)	46		
	1969	9	(21)	15	(35)	17	(40)	2	(4)	43		
	1968	5	(13)	17	(43)	9	(23)	8	(21)	39	22.43	.130
	1967	10	(39)	13	(50)	3	(11)	0	(0)	26		
	1966	5	(22)	9	(39)	7	(30)	2	(9)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XVII

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW WELL PURPOSE D (ADVICE REGARDING
LOCAL PROBLEMS) WAS ACHIEVED, ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Achievement of Purpose D										χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Very Success.		Quite Success.		Somewhat Success.		Somewhat Unsuccess.		Total			
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%				
Age Category	20-29	1	(3)	7	(21)	16	(49)	9	(27)	33		26.46	.009*
	30-39	1	(1)	11	(15)	36	(49)	26	(35)	74			
	40-49	1	(2)	8	(15)	30	(58)	13	(25)	52			
	50 and over	4	(22)	0	(0)	11	(61)	3	(17)	18			
Position Prior to Course	Principal	3	(3)	18	(18)	50	(49)	30	(30)	101		22.83	.029*
	Vice-Principal	3	(5)	6	(9)	41	(63)	15	(23)	65			
	Other	1	(10)	2	(19)	1	(19)	6	(52)	11			
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	5	(7)	7	(9)	41	(53)	24	(31)	77		6.19	.626
	less than 5 yrs	2	(2)	17	(20)	45	(51)	24	(27)	88			
	none	0	(0)	2	(17)	7	(58)	3	(25)	12			
Year of Course Attended	1970	1	(2)	6	(13)	26	(57)	13	(28)	46		24.96	.071
	1969	1	(2)	10	(24)	23	(54)	9	(21)	43			
	1968	1	(3)	4	(10)	15	(39)	19	(48)	39			
	1967	3	(12)	5	(19)	14	(54)	4	(15)	26			
	1966	1	(4)	1	(4)	15	(65)	6	(27)	23			

*Significant at the .05 level.

Effect of Background Variables on Perceived Value of

Specific Course Activities

An examination of the relationship between the Course participants' background variables and the perceived value of and extent of learnings obtained from the Course activities is presented in this section. Items 18 to 23 on the questionnaire to participants examined the perceived value of each of the six activities of the Course - the lecture series, the morning group sessions, the morning general sessions, the in-basket sessions, the problem area sessions, and the special features. Items 24 to 29 examined the extent to which the Course participants gained learnings from each activity which were later used in their own administrative practices.

Of the six Course activities, significant relationships occurred for only two activities: the problem area sessions, and the in-basket sessions. The participants' perceived value of the in-basket sessions, classified according to the background variables, is presented in Table XVIII. Similar data for the problem area sessions are shown in Table XX. Table XIX presents a classification, according to the background variables, of the extent of learnings gained by Course participants from the in-basket sessions which were later used in local practices. Similar data for the problem area sessions are presented in Table XXI. A discussion of the background variables for all

four of these Tables is presented here.

Age category. There are no significant relation-
ships between age of respondent and perceived value of
the activities.

Experience in administration. No significant
relationships appear for this variable in any of the four
Tables. However, Tables XIX and XXI suggest that a higher
percentage of respondents with less than five years exper-
ience indicated that they gained usable learnings from the
activities. The same participants tended to rate the
activities slightly higher in value in Tables XVIII and XX.

Position prior to attending the Course. No signifi-
cant relationships exist between this variable and the
ratings of the activities.

Year of Course attended. Three Tables, including
Table XVIII, XIX, and XXI, show statistically significant
relationships between the year of Course attended and rating
of the activities. An examination of Table XVIII indicates
that the participants who attended the 1967 Course tended
to rate the value of the in-basket sessions highest. Tables
XIX and XXI show that the highest percentage of usable
learnings obtained from the activities was recorded by the
1967 Course participants.

TABLE XVIII

VALUE OF IN-BASKET SESSIONS, AS PERCEIVED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Perceived Value								Total No.	χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Very Much		Substantial		Some		Little or None				
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	10	(30)	11	(31)	8	(24)	4	(13)	33		
	30-39	21	(28)	28	(38)	12	(16)	13	(18)	74	15.39	.221
	40-49	9	(17)	16	(31)	16	(31)	11	(21)	52		
	50 and over	5	(28)	4	(22)	3	(17)	6	(33)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	27	(27)	32	(32)	19	(19)	23	(22)	101		
	Vice-Principal	14	(22)	26	(40)	16	(25)	9	(13)	65	11.29	.505
	Other	4	(36)	1	(9)	4	(36)	2	(19)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	16	(21)	24	(31)	20	(26)	17	(22)	77		
	less than 5 yrs	25	(28)	34	(39)	14	(16)	15	(17)	88	10.89	.208
	none	4	(33)	1	(8)	5	(42)	2	(17)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	10	(22)	9	(20)	12	(26)	15	(32)	46		
	1969	11	(26)	18	(42)	7	(16)	7	(16)	43		
	1968	6	(15)	14	(36)	9	(23)	10	(26)	39	27.57	.036*
	1967	13	(50)	8	(31)	5	(19)	0	(0)	26		
	1966	5	(22)	10	(44)	6	(26)	2	(8)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XIX

EXTENT OF LEARNINGS GAINED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS FROM IN-BASKET SESSIONS
ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Extent of Learnings					X^2 Value	Prob.
		Did Obtain Learnings		Did Not Obtain Learnings		Total Number		
		f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	22	(67)	11	(33)	33	5.15	.161
	30-39	43	(58)	31	(42)	74		
	40-49	21	(40)	31	(60)	52		
	50 and over	12	(63)	6	(37)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	55	(54)	46	(46)	101	0.25	.967
	Vice-Principal	35	(55)	30	(45)	65		
	Other	6	(56)	5	(44)	11		
Experience in Admin-istration	5 or more yrs.	35	(45)	42	(55)	77	4.90	.086
	less than 5 yrs	55	(63)	33	(37)	88		
	none	6	(50)	6	(50)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	23	(50)	23	(50)	46	10.22	.039*
	1969	18	(41)	25	(59)	43		
	1968	19	(48)	20	(52)	39		
	1967	20	(78)	6	(22)	26		
	1966	16	(70)	7	(30)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

83

TABLE XX

VALUE OF PROBLEM AREA SESSIONS, AS PERCEIVED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Perceived Value								Total Number	χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Very Much		Substantial		Some		Little or None				
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	10	(30)	16	(49)	4	(12)	3	(9)	33		
	30-39	16	(22)	33	(45)	22	(30)	3	(4)	74	9.49	.393
	40-49	10	(19)	24	(46)	17	(33)	1	(2)	52		
	50 and over	3	(17)	6	(33)	8	(44)	1	(6)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	22	(22)	48	(48)	26	(25)	5	(5)	101		
	Vice-Principal	14	(22)	26	(40)	23	(35)	2	(3)	65	4.52	.874
	Other	3	(27)	5	(45)	2	(19)	1	(9)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	11	(14)	35	(46)	28	(36)	3	(4)	77		
	less than 5 yrs	24	(27)	40	(46)	20	(23)	4	(4)	88	7.43	.283
	none	4	(33)	4	(33)	3	(25)	1	(9)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	6	(13)	17	(37)	18	(39)	5	(11)	46		
	1969	13	(30)	21	(49)	9	(21)	0	(0)	43		
	1968	9	(23)	15	(39)	13	(33)	2	(5)	39	17.82	.121
	1967	8	(31)	13	(50)	5	(19)	0	(0)	26		
	1966	3	(13)	13	(57)	6	(26)	1	(4)	23		

TABLE XXI

EXTENT OF LEARNINGS GAINED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS FROM PROBLEM AREA SESSIONS
ACCORDING TO SELECTED BACKGROUND VARIABLES
(N=177)

Variable	Variable Categories	Extent of Learnings				Total Number	χ^2 Value	Prob.
		Did Obtain Learnings		Did Not Obtain Learnings				
		f	%	f	%			
Age Category	20-29	22	(67)	11	(33)	33		
	30-39	48	(65)	26	(35)	74	6.08	.108
	40-49	28	(55)	24	(45)	52		
	50 and over	6	(37)	12	(63)	18		
Position Prior to Course	Principal	61	(61)	40	(39)	101		
	Vice-Principal	38	(60)	27	(40)	65	1.22	.749
	Other	5	(45)	6	(55)	11		
Experience in Administration	5 or more yrs.	40	(52)	37	(48)	77		
	less than 5 yrs	59	(67)	29	(33)	88	4.34	.114
	none	6	(50)	6	(50)	12		
Year of Course Attended	1970	18	(39)	28	(61)	46		
	1969	28	(65)	15	(35)	43		
	1968	26	(66)	13	(34)	39	13.41	.009*
	1967	20	(78)	6	(22)	26		
	1966	13	(56)	10	(44)	23		

*Significant at the .05 level.

Section Summary

This section has analysed the value of the Leadership Course for the Course participants. The reactions of Course participants, superintendents, and school board chairmen indicated that the Courses had been of value to the participants, and had resulted in numerous changes in the Course participants' administrative practices.

The most common changes in administrative practice or behavior resulting from Course attendance were increased staff participation in decision-making, better understanding by the administrator of his role, improved staff-administrator relationships, more confidence in self, and improved staff communication. Furthermore, some administrative promotions resulted from Course attendance.

The Leadership Course has been successful in providing the opportunity for intercommunication of educational ideas among school administrators, and in providing information about emerging trends in educational administration.

An examination of the Course activities indicated that all activities were of value, and that the participants had acquired usable learnings and information in all of the activities. The problem area sessions were rated somewhat higher in value than the other activities.

Several relationships appeared between selected Course participants' background variables, and value of the Course. The younger participants, especially those in the

20-29 year age category, rated the Course's value and effects higher than those in the other age categories. Participants who had been vice-principals prior to the Course tended to rate the Course's value and effects slightly higher than participants who were principals. The participants with some, but less than five years experience appeared to rate the value and effects of the Course higher than the participants with none or more than five years experience.

The participants in the 1967 Leadership Course tended to rate the value and effects of their Course somewhat higher than participants in other years.

VALUE OF THE LEADERSHIP COURSE TO SCHOOL SYSTEMS

This section is an attempt to determine whether or not there are benefits, beyond those accruing to the Course participants, for school systems in sending participants to the Course.

Dissemination of Information

The effects of the Leadership Course upon the school systems would be partly dependent upon the dissemination of ideas and learnings by the Course participants upon returning to their systems. This section examines the nature and extent of the dissemination which occurred in the period 1966 to 1970.

Items 34 to 42 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" examined the dissemination of learnings gained from the Course by the participants. The results are shown in Table XXII, which reports the degree to which Course participants communicated with others upon returning from the Course. The responses indicate that the most common form of dissemination was through informal personal conversations with other teachers or administrators, followed by reports to the superintendent. Many participants also reported to the school board, to their own staffs, and to the administrators' association. Most dissemination was in the form of personal conversations, although a large number of the participants provided written reports.

Item 41 provided the Course participants with an opportunity to explain other dissemination which had occurred. Five participants provided responses, mentioning the following: use of a videotape produced at the Course in 1970, a report to the local convention committee, and a report in the local A.T.A. bulletin.

Item 42 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants" provided the opportunity for Course participants to indicate if no dissemination had occurred. Seven participants stated that this was the case.

In summary, a wide extent of dissemination of the participants' learnings occurred in the systems. Considerable difficulty arises, however, in interpreting the

TABLE XXII

DISSEMINATION OF IDEAS AND/OR LEARNINGS BY COURSE
PARTICIPANTS AFTER ATTENDING THE COURSE

Reported to:	How Reported	Number of Responses	
		Per Category	Total
School board	In writing	34	
	In person	42	91
	Both	15	
Superintendent	In writing	19	
	In person	71	100
	Both	10	
Administrators' Association	In writing	1	
	In person	68	75
	Both	6	
Own staff	In writing	3	
	In person	83	92
	Both	6	
Other staffs	In writing	0	
	In person	4	4
	Both	0	
A.T.A. Local	In writing	0	
	In person	7	8
	Both	1	
Others in personal conversation:			
- other administrators		54	
- other teachers		9	145
- both		82	

effect of the dissemination. The present research was not able to examine whether or not the dissemination of ideas held any consequences for the persons who received the information.

Responses of Superintendents and Chairmen

Item 15 on the "Questionnaire to Superintendents" and item 12 on the "Questionnaire to School Board Chairmen" examined these persons' perceptions of the value of the Leadership Course for their school systems. The responses to these items are presented in Table XXIII. Both the chairmen and the superintendents rated the value of the Course to their systems quite highly. Only one response indicated that there was little value accruing to the system. All other responses indicated that the Course had either "some", or "substantial," or "very great" value for their systems.

The superintendents and chairmen also agreed quite closely on the value of the Course, as evidenced by the similar means of the responses and the high probability for the chi-square value.

In an effort to examine the specific benefits of the Leadership Course for the school systems, both super-intendents and chairmen were asked, in open ended questions, to indicate what benefits there had been for the school systems in sending participants to the Leadership Course. Table XXIV describes the responses to this question. The

TABLE XXIII

VALUE OF THE LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR SCHOOL
SYSTEMS AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRMEN

Perceived Value	Responses			
	Supts. (N=57)		Chairmen (N=55)	
1. Very great	4	(7)*	5	(9)*
2. Substantial	31	(55)	25	(46)
3. Some	22	(38)	24	(43)
4. Little	0	(0)	1	(2)
Mean Response**	2.3		2.4	

Chi-square value = 1.71 (for 3df)
Probability = .62

*Indicates the % of N.
**Obtained by averaging the numbers assigned to each
category.

TABLE XXIV

EFFECTS OF THE LEADERSHIP COURSE UPON SCHOOL
SYSTEMS, AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS
AND SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRMEN

Effect	Frequency of Response	
	Supts.	Chairmen
1. Improved individuals in the system.	22	23
2. Kept administrative staff aware of new developments in educational administration.	11	8
3. Provided administrative staff with opportunity to share ideas with others.	8	7
4. Made school board more aware of developments in education.	2	3
5. More innovations in our system.	3	2

most frequent response, both by the superintendents and the chairmen, was that the Course had improved the individuals who attended by making them more confident, enthusiastic, involving, or aware of their roles, and that this had therefore benefited the system. Some responses indicated that the Course had succeeded in keeping the total administrative staff of the system aware of new developments in education, and had provided an opportunity for administrators in the system to share ideas with principals in other systems. Increased numbers of innovations in the system, and improved school board awareness of developments in educational administration were also mentioned.

These findings indicate that the value of the Leadership Course is perceived by superintendents and chairmen as accruing mainly to the individuals who attended, with resulting benefits to the entire school system. In systems where many principals have attended the Leadership Course, the cumulative effect of the Leadership Course upon the system likely would be greater than in systems where limited numbers of administrators have attended.

Further indication of the value of the Leadership Course to the school system was indicated by item 17 on the "Questionnaire to School Board Chairmen." This item asked whether or not the school system would continue to sponsor delegates to the Course. Forty-four of the chairmen indicated that the system would continue to sponsor delegates,

while ten were uncertain and only one stated that the system would not be represented in the future. These results suggest that the Course is perceived to be of value to the systems, or otherwise a larger number of negative responses might have occurred.

Section Summary

This section has examined the value of the Leader-ship Course to the school systems from which participants have come. The results tended to indicate that the value of the Course for the system is mainly through the improved quality of individual administrators in the system.

Considerable dissemination of learnings by Course participants has occurred in the systems. The most common form of dissemination was through personal conversations with administrators, teachers, the superintendent, and the school board.

The school board chairmen indicated that in most cases, continued sponsorship by the system of participants to the Course was likely.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN THE COURSE'S PURPOSES, ORGANIZATION, AND ACTIVITIES

Various aspects of the purposes, organization, and activities of the Leadership Course are examined in this section.

Type of Participant Selected

Table XXV presents the responses to item 8 on the "Questionnaire to Superintendents," which asked the super- intendents to indicate the type of participant generally selected to represent the system. The most commonly selected participant appears to be the inexperienced administrator.* The experienced administrator in need of a refresher or "updating" experience is often selected as well. Several of the superintendents indicated that the criterion for selection varies from year to year, or that no specific criterion for selection is used.

Course Purposes

The Course participants' perceptions of how well the Leadership Course has achieved its purposes are des- cribed in the first section of this chapter. The partici- pants' reactions of the degree of achievement of each of five purposes was presented in Table VIII (page 62). The participants indicated that all of the purposes were being achieved to some degree, with "providing for the inter- communication of educational ideas" achieving the highest rating. A Course purpose which has not been included in the stated purposes since 1966, "providing assistance with the participant's own unique problems," achieved the lowest rating.

---

*Table V (Page 54) indicates that the superinten- dents' perceptions of "inexperienced" must refer to those participants with some, but less than five years experience.

TABLE XXV

TYPE OF COURSE PARTICIPANT SELECTED BY SCHOOL SYSTEMS,
AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERINTENDENTS
(N=57)

Type of Participant	Responses	
	f	% of N
Effective experienced administrator	4	7
Experienced administrator in need of a refresher experience	9	16
Inexperienced administrator	27	47
Individual moving into administration for the first time	1	2
No specific criterion is used	4	7
Varies from year to year	12	21

Item 15 on the "Questionnaire to Course Partici-
pant" requested the participants' views on which of
several stated purposes ought to be the most important
in a Course of this sort. Forty-eight percent of the
respondents indicated that "providing for the intercommun-
ication of ideas" ought to be the most important purpose,
while 35 percent said that "providing information about
emerging trends" should be most important. The other
purposes were mentioned as being most important by only a
small percentage of the respondents.

Item 17 on the "Questionnaire to Course Participants"
provided respondents with an opportunity to suggest other
purposes which the Course ought to have. The responses,
although limited in number, included the following:
elucidation of the practical aspects of administrative
theory; discussion of topical matters such as the new
School Act; discussion of teacher apathy; and provision
of the opportunity for intercommunication with school
board personnel and superintendents. An examination of
these topics indicates that they could be subsumed by the
present Course objectives.

In conclusion, the present Course purposes, which
are being successfully achieved by the Course programs,
appear to require little modification.

Course Content and Activities

Item 8 on the questionnaire to participants pro-

vided information as to the relevance of the Course content

for the Course participants' own administrative situations.

The results are tabulated in Table XXVI. Only two percent

of the respondents indicated little or no relevance for

their own situations, while 72 percent indicated that the

content was "quite" and "very" relevant.

Further information about the Course activities

was obtained in items 18 to 23 on the "Questionnaire to

Course Participants." In these items, the respondents

were asked to rate the value of each activity. The results

were reported in Table VI (page 58), which illustrated that

all activities were perceived to be of value, with the

problem area sessions achieving a slightly higher rating

than the others.

The same items also contained provision for the

participants' comments about the strengths and weaknesses

of each activity. A summary of the comments about each

activity is presented below.

Lecture series. The most frequently mentioned com-

ment about the lecture series was that it did provide infor-

mation about new trends and developments in educational

administration. A number of participants indicated that

the lectures were stimulating and provided "food for thought."

The most common weakness of the lecture series men-

tioned was the fact that they tended to be too theoretical

and did not emphasize the practical aspects of the topics.

TABLE XXVI

COURSE PARTICIPANTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE RELEVANCE
OF THE COURSE CONTENT FOR THEIR OWN
ADMINISTRATIVE SITUATIONS
(N=177)

Perceived Relevance	Responses	
	f	% of N
5. Very relevant	27	15.0
4. Quite relevant	101	57.0
3. Somewhat relevant	46	26.0
2. Barely relevant	2	1.5
1. Not relevant at all	1	0.5

Mean response = 3.9

Two participants commented on the fact that many lecturers seemed to assume wrongly that all Course participants had administrative training. Other comments about the lecture series indicated that some lectures were too long, and that lectures which were read were less effective than those delivered less formally.

Morning group sessions. The major strength of these sessions, as evidenced by the comments, appears to be their success in emphasizing and bringing out the practical aspects of the lectures. Some of the weaknesses of these sessions which were mentioned by the participants included the following: they often deteriorated into "gripe" sessions which were often dominated by one or two persons; the sessions were too short; and, the sessions were hampered by the requirement of having to formulate questions for the lecturer.

Morning general sessions. Nearly all of the comments regarding these sessions were by respondents who had rated the value of the sessions low. The comments suggested that the morning general sessions were limited in value due to several factors: the large size of the group; the fact that the sessions were often monopolized by one or two persons; and, the limited time allotted for these sessions.

In-basket sessions. The comments regarding the in-basket sessions indicated that for many participants

these sessions were extremely valuable. Specific comments
suggested that the in-basket sessions were stimulating
and interesting, topical, informative, and realistic.
The major criticism of these sessions was that they were
artificial and unrealistic, and not applicable to local
situations. A greater proportion of participants who
attended Courses prior to 1970 complained about the
American orientation of the materials.

Problem area sessions. The major strength of these
sessions appears to be the opportunity they provide for
intercommunication between principals. A number of comments
indicated that these sessions enable the participant to
learn about similar problems that exist in other schools.
A number of respondents indicated that these sessions en-
able a person to learn about the nearly universal nature
of many administrative problems, and to discuss attempted
solutions to these problems. Several respondents indicated
that the problem area sessions were the most valuable
activity of the whole Course. Very few comments were pro-
vided regarding weaknesses of the problem area sessions.

Special features. Very few negative comments were
given about this activity. Most of the participants in-
dicated that the special features, particularly the panel
discussions initiated in 1969, were interesting and of
practical value. Numerous respondents stated that the
visits to schools during summer months were interesting,

but of little practical value.

Integration of Course Activities

Item 33 on the "Questionnaire to Course Partici-
pants" attempted to determine the participants' perceptions
as to the extent of integration of all of the Course
activities. The results, presented in Table XXVII, indic-
ate that the participants felt that the Course activities
were well integrated. Only five percent of the respondents
stated that the activities were integrated very little or
not at all. Seventy-five percent reported a considerable
degree of integration.

TABLE XXVII

EXTENT OF INTEGRATION OF COURSE ACTIVITIES AS
PERCEIVED BY COURSE PARTICIPANTS
(N=177)

Extent of Integration	Responses	
	f	% of N
5. Very much	16	9.0
4. Substantial	117	66.0
3. Some	35	20.0
2. Very little	8	4.5
1. None	1	0.5

Further Recommendations

A number of items on the questionnaires used in this
study provided the Course participants, superintendents, and

school board chairmen with an opportunity to make recom-
mendations regarding the purposes, organization, and
activities of the Leadership Course.

Course participants' recommendations. Items 45
and 46 on the questionnaire to the participants requested
further recommendations about the Course. The following
suggestions and recommendations are representative of those
put forth by the participants:

1. "Provide more well planned organized evening
functions. Even informal activities are beneficial,
in that they provide an opportunity for intercom-
munication of ideas."

2. "Involve principals in the planning of the
Course."

3. "Increase the practical application aspects of
the Course."

4. "Increased emphasis should be placed on the
group sessions, with slightly more time for them, and
less time for the lectures."

5. "More reaction panels, composed of principals,
teachers, students, parents, superintendents, and school
board personnel would be good."

6. "Some sessions should be devoted the adminis-
tration and supervision of specific subject areas."

7. "Role playing activities could be used."

8. "Resource persons from other fields besides
educational administration would broaden the scope of
the Course."

9. "Continue to use the "live-in" approach, since
much value results from the informal interaction that
results from constant close contact with others."

10. "Attempt to include, as participants, more of
the experienced administrators in the field, who become
somewhat inflexible after several years of practice."

11.   "Continue with the present approach which is
quite different from credit courses where evaluation
and a mark becomes a major factor in the participant's
mind. In the Leadership Course, the relaxed low
stress atmosphere provides an opportunity for a
tremendous learning experience."

12.   "Continue, as in 1970, to videotape the Course.
This tape provides the Course participants with a good
avenue for disseminating some of the results of the
Course to other administrators, teachers, and school
board personnel in his local system."

13.   "Provide brief outlines of each lecture ahead
of time, so that questions could be considered well
ahead of time."

Superintendents' recommendations. Item 18 on the

questionnaire to superintendents obtained their perceptions

of what the value and benefits of the Leadership Course

should be. Nearly all of the responses indicated that the

Course should result in improved principals who are more

innovative, enthusiastic, and confident. This result

should be achieved by providing Course participants with

information regarding new developments in educational

administration, and by providing the opportunity for inter-

communication of ideas.

Item 19 asked the superintendents for suggestions on

how better dissemination of learnings by the Course part-

icipants might be effected. The superintendents recommended

the following: reports in person or in writing to fellow

administrators, the superintendent, and the school board;

use of the videotape; and, conducting local in-service

activities for other administrators.

Item 20 on the questionnaire to the superintendents enabled the respondents to make further comments about the Leadership Course. Some of the specific recommendations provided were as follows: involve principals in the planning of the Course; continue to videotape for local system use; and, invite school board members to attend the Course.

School board chairmen's recommendations. In item 15 on the "Questionnaire to School Board Chairmen" the respondents were asked to suggest what benefits there should be for school systems in sending participants to the Course. The responses were nearly identical to the superintendents' responses to a similar question. In general, the chairmen felt that the Course should continue to provide the opportunity for intercommunication of ideas, and to provide information about recent developments in educational administration. By doing these things, the Course should help keep the quality of school leadership in the school systems high, and result in an increased number of innovations in the system.

Section Summary

Various aspects of the purposes, activities, and organization of the leadership Course have been examined in this section.

The findings indicated that inexperienced administrators are the most popular choice of candidate by the

school systems, although in a large number of cases, no criterion for choosing a candidate appears to exist.

With the possible exception of providing advice regarding the Course participants' local problems, the Course appears to be achieving its purposes successfully.

The present Course activities all appear to have value and to be well integrated. The activities appear to be relevant for the participants' own administrative practices. However, some modifications in the activities were suggested by the Course participants. The lecture series should be as practical as possible. The group sessions must not be dominated by one or two individuals. Other comments suggested that the morning general sessions involved too large a group; that the simulation exercises were too artifical; and that the visits to schools lacked value during the summer months.

Numerous recommendations by Course participants, superintendents, and school board chairmen regarding Course activities, purposes, and organization were presented. All respondents indicated that the opportunity provided during the Course for the intercommunication of ideas was valuable, and that any activities which foster this should be encouraged. The specific recommendations provided by the respondents form the basis for a number of the recommendations in the final chapter of this thesis.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The analysis of the data has been presented in this chapter. The value of the Leadership Course to the Course participants has been shown. The results indicated that the Course has been of value to the participants and has resulted in numerous changes in the administrative practices of the participants. The most common changes in administrative practice resulting from Course attendance were increased staff involvement in decision-making, better staff communication, and improved staff-administrator relationships. Improved personal attitudes and increased confidence on the part of the Course participants also resulted from Course attendance.

The present study indicated that the value of the Leadership Course to the school systems in Alberta is difficult to determine. However, the value of the Course to the system seems to be through improved individual administrators within the system.

One of the major strengths of the Course appears to be its success in providing information about current developments in educational administration. In addition, the opportunity for administrators to meet and discuss similar problems with other administrators has been a major strength of the Course.

The activities of the Course were examined in this chapter. All appear to have value, with the problem area sessions rating highest in this regard. Some modifications to the activities were suggested in the chapter.

The effect of certain variables, including the Course participant's age, position prior to the Course, and experience in administration were shown to be related to the perceived value and effects of the Course. The participants in the 20-29 year age category rated the value and effects of the Course higher than those in the other age categories. The participants with some, but less than five years experience appeared to rate the value and effects of the Course higher than the participants with none or more than five years experience. Participants who were vice-principals prior to the Course tended to rate the Course higher than participants who were principals. Participants in the 1967 Course rated the value and effects of their Course somewhat higher than participants in other years.

Numerous recommendations were provided by the participants, superintendents, and school board chairmen regarding the purposes, organization, and activities of the Course. Some modifications in the activities, such as increasing the practical aspects of the lecture series, were suggested. The comments indicated that activities which promote intercommunication of ideas should be encouraged. Suggestions were provided as to how better dissemination of ideas could be facilitated.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The Problem Under Investigation

The present study was an attempt to assess and
evaluate the Alberta Leadership Course. The study was
initiated, in part, in response to recurring questions
raised within the Leadership Course Policy Committee
meetings in recent years as to whether the continued
operation of the Course was warranted. The study specific-
ally examined the following: the value of the Leadership
Course to the individuals who attended as Course participants
in the period 1966-1970; the value of the Course to the school
systems from which participants came; and, the strengths and
weaknesses of the purposes, organization, and activities of
the Leadership Course. This thesis also provides a record
of the history of the Alberta Leadership Course since its
inception in 1956.

Research Methodology

Data regarding the three problems under investigation
were obtained by sending questionnaires to Course partici-
pants who attended the Course in the period 1966-1970, to
Alberta school superintendents, and to school board chairmen

of Alberta school systems which had been represented at the Course in the period 1966 to 1970. The data so collected were analysed to obtain frequency distributions, percentages, and means. Some statistical operations were performed on the data using nonparametric statistics.

A summary of the results of the analysis, and a description of the conclusions arising out of the study are presented in the next section.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Value and Effects of the Leadership Course

Upon Course participants. The Leadership Course has had definite value for those persons who attended as participants. Some administrative promotions, improved status, or other advancements were perceived to bear relationship to Course attendance.

Numerous changes and improvements in the participants' own administrative practices resulted from Course attendance. These changes can be divided into two broad categories: actual changes in some aspect of administrative practice; and, changes or improvements in the attitude of the individual.

Specific changes in administrative practice resulting from Course attendance included the following: increased staff and student involvement in school decision-making; improved communication patterns within the school; better

relationships between the administrator and the staff and students; improved school public relations; and, improved evaluation, resource allocation, timetabling, pupil reporting, and teacher placement procedures.

In terms of attitudinal change, the Course participants reported the following effects: greater confidence in self; more sensitivity towards others; greater consideration of alternatives; and, an improved attitude towards the administrative role.

Relationships appeared to exist between the Course participant's age, experience in administration, and prior position, and the value and effects of the Course upon him. The Course participants who were younger and less experienced appeared to rate the value and effects of the Course higher than did the older more experienced participants.

There are some possible explanations which can be inferred about this finding. Perhaps the older and more experienced administrators are not as susceptible to change as are younger less experienced administrators. Seger (1966:54) reported that younger principals tend to be more innovative than older principals. Another possible explanation is that the younger less experienced participants may still have been grasping for suitable techniques and procedures for handling their administrative problems, whereas older and more experienced persons may have learned through practice, of suitable ways and means of handling the problems.

Another observation was that the 1967 Course participants rated their Course higher in value and effects than participants of other years.

In general, the Course participants' ratings of the value and effect of the Leadership Course obtained from the data collected for the present study tended to be slightly lower than the ratings obtained from the evaluations carried out each year at the conclusion of the Leadership Course. This result might be partially due to the fact that the participants may have forgotten about certain aspects of the Course with the passage of time. Another explanation might be that some of the enthusiasm which the participants had at the time of the Course, when they filled out the evaluation, may have disappeared when faced with the realities of administrative practice.

Upon school systems. Considerable dissemination of learnings and information obtained at the Course was carried out by the Course participants. The most common type of dissemination was in the form of personal conversations with other administrators, the superintendent, and the school board.

Although the superintendents and school board chairmen rated the value of the Leadership Course for their systems quite high, their responses indicated that the value accrues mainly to the individuals who did attend the Course. The value of the Course for the system appears

to be in terms of the improvement it produces in the attitudes and administrative practices of the administrators within the school system who attended the Leadership Course.

Course Purposes

This study showed that the present Course purposes are all being achieved with relative success. The Leadership Course has been most successful in "providing an opportunity for intercommunication of ideas" among the Course participants. The participants indicated that this is one of the most valuable aspects of the Course. The other purposes that have been achieved successfully by the Leadership Course are "providing information about emerging trends in educational administration" and "providing an opportunity for the cooperative solution of problems." The Course purpose which has been achieved least successfully is "providing assistance with the participants' own unique problems." The fact that this purpose has not been included in the stated purposes of the Course since 1965 might explain the low rating.

Due to the fact that all of the present Course purposes were rated high in value, and since few alternative purposes were suggested by the respondents, it appears that the present purposes require little modification or change.

Course Activities

The activities which have been part of the Leadership Course were examined in this study. The results indicated that all of the activities have been of value to the Course participants. Moreover, all of the activities have been useful in terms of providing information or learnings which the participants later used in their own administrative practices. In terms of the value and effects of the six major Course activities, the problem area sessions were rated highest, followed by the in-basket sessions. The morning general sessions were rated the lowest in terms of their value and effects.

The activities of the Leadership Course were shown to be relevant for the participant's own administrative practice. The Course participants also indicated that they felt a high degree of integration between the activities had been achieved.

A number of weaknesses were shown to exist in some of the Course activities. The lectures were thought to be too theoretical by some Course participants. The participants indicated that the group sessions in general, and the morning group sessions in particular, often deteriorated into 'gripe sessions." Some participants indicated that the in-basket sessions were rather unrealistic and artificial. Complaints regarding the morning general sessions included reference to the large size of the group, the limited time allotted, and the domination of the sessions by one or two individuals.

Despite the weaknesses in the activities suggested above, the participants' responses did indicate, however, that the present Course activities have been successful in achieving some or all of the purposes of the Leadership Course. The present activities, with some modifications or additions, should be continued in the future.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The results of this study indicate that the Leadership Course has been successful in achieving its purposes, and has been of value to the persons who have attended the Course. The effect of the Leadership Course upon the administrative practices in Alberta schools appears to be substantial. By improving the administrative practices and leadership in schools, the Course may have had some desirable effects upon the education provided for children in the province.

The results of this study therefore lead to the following conclusion: the Leadership Course should continue to be held in this province. However, the present study also indicates that some modifications should be considered in the organization and operation of the Course.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The basic recommendation arising out of this study is that the operation of the Leadership Course should be

continued, with some modifications, deletions, and additions

to its organization and operation. The specific recommend-

ations regarding the organization and operation of the

Course are listed below.

1. The present Course purposes require little

modification or change. The major value of the Course

appears to lie in the opportunity it provides for inter-

communication of ideas and for the dissemination of infor-

mation about new and emerging developments in educational

administration.

2. Every effort must be made to emphasize the

practical aspects of the information presented during the

Course. Along with the presentation of theoretical infor-

mation, lectures ought to emphasize relationships to

practice.

3. The present activities, with the possible excep-

tion of the morning general sessions, appear to be both

valuable and useful. Continued use of the present activities

is recommended. Considerable thought must be given to ways

of improving the morning general sessions, however. Further-

more, activities such as role playing could be used in future

Courses.

4. The problem area sessions appear to be one of

the most beneficial activities of the Leadership Course.

Some thought might be given to expanding these activities

slightly. It may be that the morning general sessions ought

to be replaced with an activity similar, but not identical

to, the problem area sessions. Perhaps the morning group
sessions following the lecture could be extended, with an
arrangement allowing the lecturer to visit each group. A
reaction panel for the lecturer could be used briefly to
complete the morning activities.

  4. The group consultants must make every effort
to prevent domination of the group sessions by one or two
individuals. Everyone should be encouraged to participate
in group discussions and activities.

  6. Consideration should be given to providing time
for discussions of the administration and supervision of
specific subject areas, as was the practice on a limited
scale during the afternoon sessions of the 1966 Course.

  7. The Course should continue, and perhaps expand
the practice introduced in the 1969 and 1970 programs of
allowing for interaction between the Course participants
and students, parents, teachers, and school board personnel.
In addition, an opportunity could be provided for inter-
action with superintendents, Department of Education person-
nel, and other school personnel such as guidance counsellors
and subject area specialists.

  8. Any activity which allows for intercommunication
of ideas should be stressed. Evening activities, of either
a formal or informal nature, such as have been character-
istic of the Course, might be expanded and used to greater
advantage. The importance of intercommunication provides

ample reason for continuing with the practice of having participants "live-in" during the Course.

9. Principals and other school administrators might be involved in the planning of the Leadership Course. Consideration should be given to having a previous Course participant on the Policy Committee, and also having that person work in consultation with the Course director in planning the Course.

10. Increased numbers of experienced administrators should be encouraged to attend the Course. School boards might be made aware of the fact that these persons can benefit from the Course as much as inexperienced administrators. Furthermore, school boards who have sent only limited numbers of participants should be made aware of the value of the Course, and should be urged to sponsor representatives.

11. Course participants must be urged to disseminate the learnings and information obtained at the Course. Some of the possible avenues through which such dissemination might occur would include the following: written and verbal reports to the superintendent, the board, other administrators, and teachers; use of the videotapes produced during the Course; the initiation of local in-service activities using the reports or the videotapes; and, the loaning of the Alberta School Principal to other persons.

12. An attempt should be made to continue to videotape the Course proceedings. The tape produced in 1970 served as a valuable instrument for publicizing the nature of the Course.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

In the years ahead the number of in-service activities for school administrators may increase, and there may be a consequent need for a careful examination of the value and effects of such activities. The present research may provide a basis for the evaluation of similar in-service activities.

An evaluation of the Alberta Leadership Course, similar to the present study, would be warranted again in the future. Although such a study might be general in nature, it might also be possible to examine, in greater detail, the value and effects of the Course upon the individuals who attended the Course. Pre-Course examination of the attitudes and administrative practices of prospective Course participants could be compared with their post-Course attitudes and practices, to determine the nature and extent of changes which might occur. Such a study might also examine the characteristics of the Course participants in whom major changes in attitude or practice occur.

An examination of the value and effects of pre-service training programs for school administrators would

provide information on which to base improvements or modifications in such programs. The present research might provide a context, in part, for such an evaluation study.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS

American Association of School Administrators. Inservice Education for School Administrators. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1963.

Andrews, J.H.M. (ed.). The Alberta School Principal. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1958.

Ayer, F.C. "Five Research Procedures for Determining the Value of In-Service Training for Administrators," The Nation's Schools, XXXXVII (June, 1951), 63-66.

Bergen, J.J. (ed.). Administration for Student Development. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1969.

Bergen, J.J. and N.J. Chamchuk (eds.). The Principal's Role in the 70's. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1970.

Bessent, E.W. Designs for Inservice Education. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1969.

Blocksidge, J.H. "Change of Leader Behavior Attributable to the Leadership Course for School Principals." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1964.

Bumbarger, C.S., and D. Friesen (eds.). Social Problems and the Schools. A Report of the Eleventh Annual Banff Conference. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1969.

Canadian Education Association. Educational Leadership in the Superintendency. Part I of the Report of the Canadian Education Association Short Course. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1954.

_____ . "Leadership Course for Principals," News Letter, April, 1956.

Downey, L.W., M. Skuba, and N. Hrynyk (eds.). Organization - A Means to Improved Instruction. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1962.

Enns, F. (ed.). The Tasks of the Principal. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1963.

Enns, F. (ed.). <u>The Principal and Program Development</u>.
    Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for
    School Principals, 1964.

Ferguson, George A. <u>Statistical Analysis in Psychology and
    Education</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

Frasure, K.J. "Your Leadership Development Program."
    Paper presented to the 1968 Annual Conference of the
    American Association of School Administrators, February,
    1968, Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Gathercole, F.J. "The Professional Development of Staff,"
    <u>The Canadian Administrator</u>, II (December, 1962), 9-12.

Goldhammer, K. "Implications for Change in Training
    Programs," <u>Knowledge Production and Utilization</u>, T.L.
    Eidell and J.M. Kitchel, editors. Eugene, Oregon:
    University of Oregon Press, 1968.

Hass, C. Glenn. "In-Service Education Today," <u>In-Service
    Education for Teachers, Supervisors, and Administrat-
    ors</u>, N.B. Nelson, editor. Chicago: National Society
    for the Study of Education, 1957.

Howsam, R.B. "In-Service Education of School Adminis-
    trators." Paper presented to the University Council
    for Educational Administration Task Force Seminar on
    Continued Education of School Administrators, April,
    1966, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Johnson, C.B. "Leadership in In-Service Education," <u>The
    Alberta School Principal</u>, J.H.M. Andrews, editor.
    Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for
    School Principals, 1959.

Kaplan, Abraham. <u>The Conduct of Inquiry</u>. San Francisco:
    Chandler Publishing Co., 1964.

Kornhauser, A., and P.B. Sheatsley. "Questionnaire Con-
    struction and Interview Procedure," <u>Research Methods
    in Social Relations</u>, Claire Selltiz et al., editors.
    New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1959.

MacKay, D.A. "Inservice Education: A Strategy for Staff
    Development," <u>The Principal and Program Development</u>,
    F. Enns, editor. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leader-
    ship Course for School Principals, 1964.

_____. "Director's Report: 1968 Leadership Course for
    School Principals." Edmonton: Department of Education-
    al Administration, University of Alberta, 1968a.

MacKay, D.A. (ed.). The Principal as an Administrator. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1968b.

Miklos, E. (ed.). Program and Personnel. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1965.

_____. "Director's Report: 1967 Leadership Course for School Principals." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1967.

Miklos, E., and A.N. Stewart (eds.). Developing a Concept of the Principalship. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1967.

Moore, Hollis A., Jr. Studies in School Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.

_____. (ed.). Professional Administrators for America's Schools. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1960.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. Experience in Leadership. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Policy Committee. Program of the 1961 Leadership Course. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1961.

_____. Program of the 1962 Leadership Course. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1962.

_____. Program of the 1965 Leadership Course. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1965.

_____. Program of the 1966 Leadership Course. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1966.

Reeves, A.W. "Skills of an Effective Principal," The Skills of an Effective Principal, L.W. Downey, editor. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1961.

_____. "Preparation of Educational Administrators," Canadian Education and Research Digest, VII (September, 1967), 173-183.

Schmuck, R. "Social Psychological Factors in Knowledge Utilization," Knowledge Production and Utilization, T.L. Eidell and J.M. Kitchel, editors. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Press, 1968.

Seger, J.E. "Principals as Innovators," The Principal and Educational Change, E. Miklos and J. Farquhar, editors. Edmonton: Policy Committee, Leadership Course for School Principals, 1966.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1959.

Siegal, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.

Willis, B.C. "Continuing Education for Present Administrators," Preparing Administrators: New Perspectives, Jack Culbertson and S. Hencley, editors. Columbus: University Council for Educational Administration, 1962.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Toward Improved School Administration. Battle Creek, Michigan: W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1961.

Worth, W.H. (ed.). Leadership Course for School Principals. Edmonton: Division of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1956a.

_____. "Some Highlights of the Leadership Course for School Principals." Paper read at the Fiftieth Annual Convention of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, November, 1956b, Edmonton, Alberta. (Available in the November, 1956 edition of the Alberta School Trustee.)

Wynn, Richard. "Organization and Administration of the Professional Program," Administrative Behavior in Education, R.F. Campbell and R.T. Gregg, editors. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

II. OTHER SOURCES

Andrews, J.H.M. (Assistant Director, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education) Correspondence. February 18, 1971.

Bergen, J.J. (Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta) Personal interviews. February 5, 15, and 18, 1971.

Bride, K.W. (Executive Assistant, A.T.A.) Correspondence. Febrary 3, 1971.

Bridges, E.A. (Director, Midwest Administration Centre, University of Chicago) Gorrespondence. January 3, 1971.

Dalzell, A.H. (Assistant Superintendent, Ontario Department of Education) Correspondence. November 20, 1970.

Enns, F. (Associate Dean, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta) Correspondence. February 10, 1971.

Herbert, J.E. (Specialist, Secondary School Administration, Oregon Board of Education) Correspondence. February 5, 1971.

Hrynyk, N.P. (Associate Executive Secretary, A.T.A.) Correspondence. February 9, 1971.

McDowell, S. (General Secretary, Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation) Correspondence. November 24, 1970.

Miklos, E. (Professor, Department of Educational Admin-istration, University of Alberta) Telephone conversat-ion. February 18, 1971; Personal interview. February 27, 1971.

Peach, J.W. (Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba) Correspondence. October 27, 1970.

Rees, R.E. (Deputy Minister, Alberta Department of Education) Correspondence. February 18, 1971.

Ratsoy, E.W. (President, Council on School Administration) Personal interview. February 15, 1971.

Smith, F.L. (Professor, Teachers College, Columbia Univer-sity) Correspondence. November 30, 1970.

Stafford, W.G. (Executive Director, Quebec Association of Protestant School Administrators) Correspondence. November 17, 1970.

Thomas, M.P. (Associate Professor, University of Texas) Correspondence. February 3, 1971.

Watt, N.S. (1970 Course Director, British Columbia Principals' Conference) Correspondence, November 24, 1970.

Weidenhamer, T.C. (Secretary Treasurer, A.S.T.A.) Personal interview. February 17, 1971.

Worth, W.H. (Commissioner, Commission on Educational Planning) Correspondence. February 9, 1971.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COURSE PARTICIPANTS

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON 7, CANADA

January 29, 1971

To: Course Participants, 1966 - 1970

From: John J. Bergen

Re: An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course
    for School Principals

        Those who have been associated with the Leadership
Course would welcome an evaluation of this activity. The
Policy Committee, representing the provincial Department
of Education, the University of Alberta, the Alberta
School Trustees' Association, and the Alberta Teachers'
Association, may gain some additional information on the
basis of which decisions affecting the Course can be made.

        Mr. George Mackenzie, an M.Ed. student with the
Department of Educational Administration, who has been
granted a research assistantship, is conducting the
major part of this study. He will compile the history
of the Course, assess its place in the context of
courses for school principals in other provinces and
in some states, and analyze the data submitted by the
respondents to questionnaires.

        A questionnaire, different from this one, is being
mailed to school board chairmen and to superintendents.

        Please complete the questionnaire and RETURN IT BY
FEBRUARY 15th, if possible, sealed in the return-addressed
envelope.

        Your assistance is much appreciated.

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>TO COURSE PARTICIPANTS</u>

      The Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals has been in operation for fifteen consecutive years. It is deemed to be of sufficient importance to make a general assessment of the perceived value of the Course at this time. School Board Chairmen, Superintendents of Schools, and Course participants during recent years, are being asked to contribute their opinions regarding the Course.

      Part of the data required for this study is being obtained by means of this questionnaire. All information will be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. The code number on the questionnaire is used for recording purposes only.

      As one who has attended the Leadership Course, you are able to provide a meaningful assessment, particularly in the context of your own experience. Please do not hesitate to record your <u>frank</u> opinions.

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO COURSE PARTICIPANTS

1) Sex: 1. Male ___   2. Female ___

2) Which was your age category at the time you attended
   the course?

   _____ 1. 20-29   _____ 2. 30-39
   _____ 3. 40-49   _____ 4. 50 or over

3) In what year or years did you attend the Leadership
   Course (Please check).

   _____ 1. 1970   _____ 2. 1969   _____ 3. 1968
   _____ 4. 1967   _____ 5. 1966

4. Position held in June immediately prior to attending
   the Course:

   _____ 1. principal
   _____ 2. vice-principal
   _____ 3. department head or coordinator
   _____ 4. other (please indicate)

   _____

5) When you attended the course, had you been an adminis-
   trator (i.e. principal, vice-principal, department
   head, etc.)

   _____ 1. for 5 or more years?
   _____ 2. for at least 1 year, but less than 5
                years?
   _____ 3. never been an administrator

6) How were you chosen? (Check most appropriate response)

   _____ 1. by the Superintendent only
   _____ 2. by the School Board only
   _____ 3. by the Superintendent and the Board
   _____ 4. I volunteered
   _____ 5. by other means (Please explain)

   _____

PART I: GENERAL EVALUATION

7) Which one of the following statements comes closest to
    stating your general reaction to the Leadership
    Courses that you attended?

    _____   5. It was of great value to me
    _____   4. It was of substantial value to me
    _____   3. It was of some value to me
    _____   2. It was of little value to me
    _____   1. It was of no value to me

8) Was the content of the Leadership Course relevant to
    your own administrative or school situation? (Check
    the most appropriate response).

    _____   5. Very relevant
    _____   4. Quite relevant
    _____   3. Somewhat relevant
    _____   2. Barely relevant
    _____   1. Not relevant at all

9) To what extent did your experiences during the Course
    meet or match your pre-course expectations? (Check
    the most appropriate response).

    _____   5. Course was much more valuable than I
                  expected
    _____   4. Slightly more valuable
    _____   3. Exactly what I expected
    _____   2. Slightly less valuable
    _____   1. Much less valuable

PART II: COURSE PURPOSES

       Below are listed the Leadership Course purposes.
Please indicate, for each one, how well the Course achieved
that purpose for you.

          Circle 5 - if the Course was very successful (in
                      achieving that purpose)
          Circle 4 - if the Course was quite successful
          Circle 3 - if the Course was somewhat successful
          Circle 2 - if the Course was somewhat unsuccessful
          Circle 1 - if the Course was quite unsuccessful

10)   Purpose A: Providing the opportunity for you to
      become better informed about emerging trends in
      the organization and administration of education at
      the school level. (Circle according to instructions
      above)

       5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

11)   Purpose B: Providing the opportunity for inter-
      communication of educational ideas and leadership
      practices.

       5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

12)   Purpose C: Providing the opportunity for co-operative
      solution of problems peculiar to the principalship.

       5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

13)   Purpose D: Providing assistance and advice regarding
      your own unique problems.

       5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

14)   Purpose E: Providing the opportunity for formulation
      of plans for later local action.

       5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

15) Which of the purposes (A, B, C, D, or E on previous page) do you feel ought to be <u>most important</u> in a course of this sort?

Purpose _____ (Please indicate letter of purpose)

16) Which of the purposes (A, B, C, D, or E) do you feel ought to be <u>second</u> most important in a course of this sort?

Purpose _____ (Please indicate letter)

17) If you feel that there are other purposes which the Course ought to have, please state these briefly.

_____

_____

PART III: COURSE ACTIVITIES AND ORGANIZATION

A) Of what value were each of the following activities of the Course <u>to you personally</u>? (You may wish to make some comments as to specific strengths, weaknesses, or recommendations for improvement)

Circle 5 - if the activity was of <u>very much value</u> to you
Circle 4 - if the activity was of <u>substantial value</u> to you
Circle 3 - if the activity was of <u>some value</u> to you
Circle 2 - if the activity was of <u>little value</u> to you
Circle 1 - if the activity was of <u>no value</u> to you

18) Lecture series

5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

19) Morning group sessions (discussion of lecture)

    5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

20) Morning general sessions (Inter-action with speaker)

    5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

21) In-basket simulation group sessions

    5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

22) Problem area group sessions

    5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

23) Special features (Visits to schools, panel
discussions, etc.).

    5.   4.   3.   2.   1.

Comments: _____

_____

B) In which of the above activities did you acquire
information or learnings that you actually put to
use in your own administrative practice? (You
may wish to check more than one.)

24) _____ Lecture series
25) _____ Morning group sessions
26) _____ Morning general sessions
27) _____ In-basket group sessions
28) _____ Problem area group sessions
29) _____ Special features

C) Assignment to groups: As you are aware, each year the
Course members are divided into groups for the problem
area and in-basket group sessions.

30) On what basis do you feel assignment to these
groups should be made? (Check the one method
you feel would be best.)

_____ 1. on the basis of interests?
2. on the basis of size of the school of
the Course member?
_____ 3. on the basis of grade levels in his
school?
_____ 4. on the basis of rural or urban school?
5. on a completely random basis (not
according to any particular criterion)
_____ 6. part time on one basis, and part time
on some other basis? If so, which two
bases? _____ and _____
_____ 7. on some other basis? If so, please
explain:

_____

_____

31) If you think that there should be inter-communication
between the groups, how might this inter-communica-
tion be facilitated?

_____

_____

D) <u>Other Organizational Details</u>

32) Do you feel that pre-Course suggested readings
are helpful in preparing participants for the
Course?

1. Yes _____   2. No _____

Any comments or recommendations?

_____

_____

33) To what extent were the various activities of the
Course integrated? (e.g. lecture series and group
sessions, etc.).

_____ 5. Very much
_____ 4. Substantially
_____ 3. Some
_____ 2. Very little
_____ 1. Not at all

If you have any suggestions as to how better inte-
gration could be achieved, please comment:

_____

_____

PART IV: EFFECTS OF COURSE

A) WHAT <u>DISSEMINATION</u> OF YOUR LEARNINGS OR <u>IDEAS</u> GAINED
FROM THE COURSE HAS OCCURRED SINCE YOU ATTENDED THE
COURSE? (May wish to check more than one).

_____ 34. You reported to the school board

1. in writing _____
2. in person _____
3. both _____

- 8 -

_____ 35. You reported to the superintendent

    1. in writing _____
    2. in person _____
    3. both _____

_____ 36. You reported to the administrators' association

    1. in writing _____
    2. in person _____
    3. both _____

_____ 37. You reported to your staff

    1. in writing _____
    2. in person _____
    3. both _____

_____ 38. You reported to other staffs

    1. in writing _____
    2. in person _____
    3. both _____

_____ 39. You reported to the A.T.A. local

    1. in writing _____
    2. in person _____
    3. both _____

_____ 40. You had personal conversations with

    1. other administrators _____
    2. other teachers _____
    3. both _____

_____ 41. Other (Please explain) _____

_____

_____ 42. No dissemination of your learnings occurred

B) Other effects of the Course

43) How much change in your own administrative practices
     might be due to attendance at the Leadership Course?

     _____ 1. Considerable change
     _____ 2. Some change
     _____ 3. Little or no change

     If it did produce changes in your administrative
     practices, please indicate briefly what some of
     these changes were:

     _____

     _____

     _____

44) To which of the following was participation at the
     Leadership Course a contributing factor? (Check
     as many as are appropriate).

     _____ 1. administrative promotion
     _____ 2. advancement other than promotion
     _____ 3. other improved status
     _____ 4. no perceived change

     Comments: _____

     _____

     _____

PART V: GENERAL COMMENTS

45) If you were a member of the planning committee for a
     future Leadership Course, what changes, deletions,
     or additions would you recommend?

     _____

     _____

46) Please add any further comments you may wish to make
     about the Leadership Course. (May wish to continue
     on the back of this page.)

          Thank you for your cooperation

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON. CANADA

January 29, 1971

(INSIDE ADDRESS)

Dear Sir:

Re: An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course
    for School Principals

     Those who have been associated with the Leadership
Course would welcome an evaluation of this activity. The
Policy Committee, representing the provincial Department
of Education, the University of Alberta, the Alberta
School Trustees' Association, and the Alberta Teachers'
Association, may gain some additional information on the
basis of which decisions affecting the Course can be made.

     Mr. George Mackenzie, an M.Ed. student with the
Department of Educational Administration, who has been
granted a research assistantship, is conducting the
major part of this study. He will compile the history
of the Course, assess its place in the context of
courses for school principals in other provinces and
in some states, and analyze the data submitted by the
respondents to questionnaires.

     A questionnaire, similar to this one, is being
mailed to school board chairmen. It is hoped that they
may be able to complete their questionnaires without
the assistance of superintendents. A much different
questionnaire is being sent to former Course participants.

     Please complete the questionnaire and RETURN IT BY
FEBRUARY 15th, if possible, sealed in the return-addressed
envelope.

     Your assistance is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

John J. Bergen
Course Director

S-1

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS</u>

The Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals
has been in operation for fifteen consecutive years. It
is deemed to be of sufficient importance to make a general
assessment of the perceived value of the Course at this
time. Superintendents of Schools, School Board Chairmen,
and Course participants during recent years, are being
asked to contribute their opinions regarding the Course.

Part of the data required for this study is being
obtained by means of this questionnaire. All information
will be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. The code number on the
questionnaire is used for recording purposes only.

Your opinions are solicited with respect to methods
used by Superintendents in selecting participants for the
Course, and with respect to your perception of the value
of the Course to your school system. Please do not hesitate
to record your <u>frank</u> opinions.

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS

1) How long have you been superintendent in your present school system? (in years) _____

2) Have you ever attended an Alberta Leadership Course? (Please check)

   _____ 1. As a participant?
   _____ 2. As a consultant?
   _____ 3. I have never attended.

3) Has there been representation from the school system under your jurisdiction to the Alberta Leadership Course in the past five years?

   1. Yes ____   2. No ____   3. Uncertain ____

4) If your school system has not been represented at the Leadership Course in recent years, indicate possible reasons why not. (check most appropriate response).

   _____ 1. the cost was too high
   _____ 2. the Course was of insufficient value
   _____ 3. we didn't hear about the Course
   _____ 4. other reasons (Please explain)

   _____

   _____

5) How is the candidate to the Leadership Course from your area chosen? (Check most appropriate response).

   _____ 1. By the superintendent alone
   _____ 2. By the school board alone
   _____ 3. By the superintendent in consultation
               with school board
   _____ 4. By the administrators' association
   _____ 5. By the administrators' association in
               consultation with the superintendent
   _____ 6. By other means (Please explain).

   _____

   _____

   _____

6) Did you receive sufficient information about the Leadership Course to enable you to select a candidate without any difficulty?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___

Comments: _____

_____

7) Did you receive the information early enough?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___

8) In general, what type of participant has represented your school system at the Leadership Course? (Indicate most common type of participant by checking one category)

    _____ 1. One who has been in administration for some time and who is considered to be an effective administrator

    _____ 2. One who has been in administration for some time but who is considered to need an up-dating or refresher experience

    _____ 3. One who has been in administration for only a short period of time

    _____ 4. One who is going to be moving into an administrative position for the first time

    _____ 5. Other (Please explain)

_____

_____

9) Have the representatives to the Leadership Course from your area reported to you upon returning from the Course in most cases?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___

10) If they did report to you, please indicate how they did so: (May wish to check more than one).

     _____ 1. in personal conversation
     _____ 2. in writing
     _____ 3. other (Please indicate)

_____

_____

Note: For items 11, 12, 13, and 14, it is accepted that your response would vary from one Course participant to another. Therefore, allow your response to be an approximate "average" respecting all Course participants from your school system.

11) What has been the general reaction of participants from your school system to the Leadership Courses? (Check most appropriate response).

     _____ 1. very satisfied with the course
     _____ 2. quite satisfied
     _____ 3. somewhat satisfied
     _____ 4. somewhat dissatisfied
     _____ 5. quite dissatisfied

12) To what extent do you feel the Course representatives communicated with other principals about the Course ater returning home?

     _____ 1. very much
     _____ 2. much
     _____ 3. some
     _____ 4. very little
     _____ 5. not at all

13) In terms of the changes that the Leadership Courses may have produced in the administrative practices of principals in your area, would you say that they produced

     _____ 1. Numerous changes in administrative practices?
     _____ 2. A substantial number of changes?
     _____ 3. Some changes?
     _____ 4. Very few changes?
     _____ 5. No changes?

14) If the Courses did produce changes in the practices of principals, please indicate briefly what some of these changes were:

_____

_____

_____

_____

15) Which one of the following statements come closest to stating your general feeling about the value of the Leadership Course for your local school system? (Check most appropriate response).

_____ 1. it is of very great value to the local school system
_____ 2. substantial value
_____ 3. some value
_____ 4. little value
_____ 5. no value

16) In your opinion, what benefits have there been for school systems in sending a participant to the Leadership Course?

_____

_____

_____

17) Do you feel that it is worth the costs involved to send a representative to the Leadership Course?

1. Yes ___   2. No ___

18) In your opinion, what benefits should there be for school systems in sending participants to the Leadership Course?

_____

_____

_____

_____

- 5 -

19) How might it be possible for the participants who do attend the Leadership Course to disseminate the information or learnings that they obtain at the Course to those who do not attend?

_____

_____

_____

_____

20) Please add any recommendations or suggestions you may have for improvement in the organization, purposes, or functions of the Leadership Course. (Please continue on the back of this page if you require more space.)

- 5 -

Thank you for your Cooperation

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SCHOOL BOARD CHAIRMEN

January 29, 1971

(INSIDE ADDRESS)

Dear Sir:

Re: An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course
    for School Principals

Those who have been associated with the Leadership
Course would welcome an evaluation of this activity. The
Policy Committee, representing the provincial Department
of Education, the University of Alberta, the Alberta
School Trustees' Association, and the Alberta Teachers'
Association, may gain some additional information on the
basis of which decisions affecting the Course can be made.

Mr. George Mackenzie, an M.Ed. student with the
Department of Educational Administration, who has been
granted a research assistantship, is conducting the
major part of this study. He will compile the history
of the Course, assess its place in the context of
courses for school principals in other provinces and
in some states, and analyze the data submitted by the
respondents to questionnaires.

A questionnaire, similar to this one, is being
mailed to school superintendents. A much different
questionnaire is being sent to former Course participants.

It is hoped that board chairmen will attempt to
complete this questionnaire independently of superintendents,
secretary-treasurers, and principals. Your opinion is to
reflect the interest of the electorate, and this may differ
from the opinions of professionals. Please respond to as
many items as you can, and omit those about which you feel
you do not have any information.

Please complete the questionnaire and RETURN IT BY
FEBRUARY 15th, if possible, sealed in the return-addressed
envelope.

Your assistance is much appreciated.

Sincerely,

John J. Bergen
Course Director

C-1

EXPLANATORY NOTE

1. If you have been the Chairman of the Board until
    recently, but are not now, please do not forward
    this questionnaire to the new chairman, but reply
    to it yourself.

2. If you have been the Chairman of the Board for
    only one year, or less than a year, and you
    prefer that the former chairman ought to reply,
    you may give this questionnaire to him. However,
    you may respond to the questionnaire yourself.

3. We cannot expect that each chairman has the
    necessary information in order to respond to
    each item on the questionnaire. Please complete
    the items as you feel you are able to do so.

4. It is important that you respond to this question-
    naire independently of other officials in your
    school system. Though you may make enquiries,
    your response is to reflect your own judgement
    as a representative of the electorate, rather
    than that of the professionals within the system.

        Your assistance with this project
        is sincerely appreciated.

                        John J. Bergen
                        Associate Professor
                        Department of Educational
                            Administration

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR

SCHOOL PRINCIPALS QUESTIONNAIRE

TO CHAIRMEN OF SCHOOL BOARDS

The Alberta Leadership Course for School Principals has been in operation for fifteen consecutive years. It is deemed to be of sufficient importance to make a general assessment of the perceived value of the Course at this time. Superintendents of Schools, School Board Chairmen, and Course participants during recent years, are being asked to contribute their opinions regarding the Course.

Part of the data required for this study is being obtained by means of this questionnaire. All information will be treated as CONFIDENTIAL. The code number on the questionnaire is used for recording purposes only.

Your opinions are solicited with respect to methods used in selecting participants for the Course, and with respect to your perception of the value of the Course to your school system. Please do not hesitate to record your frank opinions.

ALBERTA LEADERSHIP COURSE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

QUESTIONNAIRE TO CHAIRMEN OF SCHOOL BOARDS

1) Are you the present chairman of your school board?

      1. Yes ___   2. No ___

2) If you are not the present board chairman, how long were you chairman (in years?) _____

3) If you are the present board chairman how long have you been chairman of your school board? (in years)

_____

4) How many individuals have attended the Leadership Course for School Principals from the school system under your jurisdiction? _____

5) How is the candidate to the Leadership Course from your area chosen? (Check the most appropriate response)

    _____ 1. By the superintendent alone
    _____ 2. By the school board alone
    _____ 3. By the superintendent in consultation with school board
    _____ 4. By the administrators' association
    _____ 5. By the administrators' association in consultation with the superintendent
    _____ 6. By other means (Please explain)

_____

_____

    _____ 7. Uncertain

- 2 -

6) In general, what type of participant has represented your school system at the Leadership Course? (Indicate most common type of participant by checking one category.)

_____ 1. One who has been in administration for some time and who is considered to be an effective administrator

_____ 2. One who has been in administration for some time but who is considered to need an up-dating or refresher experience

_____ 3. One who has been in administration for only a short period of time

_____ 4. One who is going to be moving into an administrative position for the first time

_____ 5. Other (Please explain)

_____

_____

7) Have the representatives to the Leadership Course from your area reported to you upon returning from the Course in most cases?

1. Yes ___   2. No ___   3. Only sometimes ___

8) If the representatives did report to you, please indicate how they reported to you: (You may wish to check more than one)

_____ 1. in personal conversation
_____ 2. in writing
_____ 3. other (please elaborate)

_____

_____

Note: For items 9, 10, and 11, it is accepted that your response would vary from one Course participant to another. Therefore, allow your response to be an approximate "average" respecting all Course participants from your school system.

9) What has been the general reaction of participants
from your school system to the Leadership Courses?
(Check most appropriate response)

           _____   1.   very satisfied with the course
           _____   2.   quite satisfied
           _____   3.   somewhat satisfied
           _____   4.   somewhat dissatisfied
           _____   5.   quite dissatisfied

10) In terms of the changes that the Leadership Course
may have produced in the administrative practices of
principals in your area, would you say that it
produced: (Check most appropriate response)

           _____   1.   Numerous changes in administrative
                          practices?
           _____   2.   A substantial number of changes?
           _____   3.   Some changes?
           _____   4.   Very few changes?
           _____   5.   No changes?

11) If the Course did produce changes in the practices of
principals, please indicate briefly what some of
these changes were:

_____

_____

_____

12) Which one of the following statements come closest to
stating your general feeling about the value of the
Leadership Course for your local school system? (Check
most appropriate response)

           _____   1.   it is of very great value to the local
                          school system
           _____   2.   substantial value
           _____   3.   some value
           _____   4.   little value
           _____   5.   no value

- 4 -

13) In your opinion, what benefits <u>have there been</u> for your school system in sending a participant to the Leadership Course?

_____

_____

_____

14) Do you feel that it is worth the costs involved to send a representative to the Leadership Course?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___

15) In your opinion, what benefits <u>should there be</u> for school systems in sending participants to the Leadership Course?

_____

_____

_____

16) Is the present method of financing the Leadership Course satisfactory?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___

If No, please recommend alternative methods: _____

_____

_____

17) Do you feel that your board will continue to sponsor delegates to the Alberta Leadership Course?

    1. Yes ___   2. No ___   3. Uncertain ___

18) Please add any additional comments you may wish to make: (Please continue on the back of this page if necessary)

Thank you for your cooperation

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTERS

February 12, 1971

To: Participants in the Leadership Course for
School Principals, 1966-1970

Re: <u>An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course</u>

About two weeks ago a questionnaire was mailed to
you regarding the Leadership Course which you attended.
The purpose of this project is to assist the Policy Committee
(representing teachers, trustees, the Department of Education,
and the university) in making appropriate decisions regarding
the Course, as well as to place on record the history of
this venture. Also, the questionnaire data provides the
material for a major part of my M. Ed. thesis. I am quite
anxious to obtain the opinions of all Course participants
in recent years.

If you have received the questionnaire and returned
it, I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely
thank you for your cooperation.

It may be, however, that you may not have
received the questionnaire for some reason. If this is
the case, please check the space below and return this
slip to me so that I can mail you a questionnaire.

If you have received a questionnaire and have not
yet returned it, I would very much appreciate it if you
would do so.

Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

George Mackenzie
(Graduate Research Assistant
  to Dr. J.J. Bergen, Course
  Director)

_____ I HAVE NOT RECEIVED A QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE
SEND ME ONE AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

_____

MY NAME IS _____

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON 7, CANADA
February 12, 1971

To: Superintendents of Schools

Re: <u>An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course
for School Principals</u>

   About two weeks ago a questionnaire was mailed to
you regarding the Leadership Course for School Principals.
The purpose of this project is to assist the Policy
Committee (representing teachers, trustees, the Department
of Education, and the university) in making appropriate
decisions regarding the Course, as well as to place on
record the history of this venture. Also, the questionnaire
data provides the material for a major part of my M. Ed.
thesis. I am quite anxious to obtain the opinions of all
superintendents.

   If you have received the questionnaire and returned
it, I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely
thank you for your cooperation.

   It may be, however, that you may not have received
the questionnaire for some reason. If this is the case,
please fill out the slip provided below and return it to
me so that I can mail you a questionnaire.

   If you have received a questionnaire and have not
yet returned it, I would very much appreciate it if you
would do so.

   Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter.

                         Yours truly,

                         George Mackenzie
                         (Graduate Research Assistant
                          to Dr. J.J. Bergen, Course
                          Director)

_____ I HAVE NOT RECEIVED A QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE SEND
            ME ONE AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

            _____

            MY NAME IS: _____

FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL
ADMINISTRATION

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
EDMONTON 7, CANADA
February 12, 1971

To: Chairmen of School Boards

Re: <u>An Evaluation Study of the Leadership Course
for School Principals</u>

About two weeks ago a questionnaire was mailed to
you regarding the Leadership Course for School Principals.
The purpose of this project is to assist the Policy
Committee (representing teachers, trustees, the Department
of Education, and the university) in making appropriate
decisions regarding the Course, as well as to place on
record the history of this venture. Also, the questionnaire
data provides the material for a major part of my M. Ed.
thesis. I am quite anxious to obtain the opinions of all
school board chairmen in the province.

If you have received the questionnaire and returned
it, I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely
thank you for your cooperation.

It may be, however, that you may not have received
the questionnaire for some reason. If this is the case,
please fill out the slip provided below and return it to me
so that I can mail you a questionnaire.

If you have received a questionnaire and have not
yet returned it, I would very much appreciate it if you
would do so.

Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

George Mackenzie
(Graduate Research Assist-
ant to Dr. J.J. Bergen,
Course Director)

_____ I HAVE NOT RECEIVED A QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE SEND ME
ONE AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

_____

MY NAME IS _____